

weapon embargoed. Our military experts consider the airplane one of the strongest defensive weapons we have, and our Congress has approved this opinion by appropriating money for one of the largest aerial programs in history.

As I understand, Colonel Lindbergh has approved of this great military program for the defense of our country. Certainly, Colonel Lindbergh, when he gave this advice, did not have in mind that we would use these planes for offensive purposes.

Colonel Lindbergh evidently considers powder an offensive weapon because it is on the embargo list. I cannot conceive how any country could defend itself successfully today without powder and explosives. Colonel Lindbergh evidently does not consider that gasoline and oil are offensive weapons because they are not on the embargo list; and yet the plane which carries the bomb that destroys the lives of innocent people could not operate without gasoline; and the submarine which destroys innocent neutral merchantmen, together with the lives of their seamen on board—without a trace—could not be operated without oil.

Statesmen must strive to be sincere, as well as logical, even in the government of their sentiments.

2. The unrestricted sale of purely defensive armaments: This policy is totally undefined, as becomes evident in the analysis of his No. 1 policy.

3. As to his third policy, that is carried out more strongly in the proposed legislation than was ever before undertaken by this country or any other.

4. As to his fourth policy, the existing law, as well as the proposed law, in accordance with the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States on the Johnson Act, prohibits any credit to belligerent governments, and customary drafts, checks and acceptances are construed as cash.

Colonel Lindbergh says:

I do not believe that repealing the arms embargo would assist democracy in Europe because I do not believe this is a war for democracy.

I do not know what definition Colonel Lindbergh gives to democracies, or what definition he gives to totalitarian powers. There are certainly totalitarian powers in Europe, and there are other powers that are not totalitarian, which are based upon principles of democracy as we understand such principles.

Was Czechoslovakia a democracy? Was Czechoslovakia attempting to defend her democracy, or was Czechoslovakia engaged in power politics?

Was poor Poland mobilizing her forces and attempting to obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purpose of power politics or for the purpose of defending her democracy?

Were Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, through the mobilization of their forces, preparing to defend their form of government, or were such mobilizations for the purpose of power politics?

Germany, before she brought about war against Czechoslovakia and Poland, purchased arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States. Was it right to permit a country preparing for war to obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war; and, when she was prepared, start war, and then prevent her peaceful neighbors from obtaining the same materials for defense by starting war against them?

Are Finland, Norway, and Sweden mobilizing their forces by reason of power politics and a desire for conquest? Is it not evident that they are threatened by conquest, and are seeking to defend their democracies?

Colonel Lindbergh is patriotic, beyond a doubt, yet Colonel Lindbergh sees that the present law injures Great Britain and France, and that its repeal will remove such injury. Apparently he cannot see that the present law not only injures Great Britain and France, but gives great aid to Germany, Italy, and Russia. He cannot see that one of our domestic laws which aids one of the belligerents is unneutral, but he thinks that if we had no law at all that would be unneutral.

The most unfortunate part of Colonel Lindbergh's statement is that it encourages the ideology of the totalitarian gov-

ernments, and is subject to the construction that he approves of their brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or threat of destruction through war.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 16, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, hearken, we beseech Thee, to our prayer, as we confess our sins and ask for guidance through the coming hours. Save us from despairing of the age that presses round us with its questions and denials, and help us to find in each perplexity with which we are confronted only the prelude to the coming of the Son of Man with healing in His wings. If we have closed and barred the doors of our understanding against unwelcome truth, may it return by secret paths and find its way within. Grant that the ears which have heard the voice of Thy songs may be deaf to the voice of clamor and dispute; that the eyes which have seen Thy love, may behold Thy blessed hope; that the feet which have walked in Thy courts may walk only in the region of light, and that the hearts which Thou hast touched may be purified even as by fire. So shall we become masters of ourselves that we may truly serve our country and our God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, October 14, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahay	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Bridges	Green	McNary	Taft
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### PETITION

Mr. MINTON presented the petition of members of Local Union No. B-9, International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, of Gary, Ind., praying for the retention of the existing embargo on the export of arms and munitions to nations at war, and the maintenance of a policy of strict neutrality, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2986. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and noxious insects and other pests affecting agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 2987. A bill to reform the lease for the Sellwood Station of the Portland, Oreg., post office; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted an amendment, and Mr. TAFT submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR McNARY ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on pending neutrality legislation delivered by Senator McNARY October 15, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON REPEAL OF THE ARMS EMBARGO

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the repeal of the arms embargo delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah before the American Academy of Political and Social Science at Philadelphia on October 14, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by himself on October 15, 1939, on the subject of pending neutrality legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY PAUL V. McNUTT BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at Baltimore, Md., on October 14, 1939, by Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, before Social Security Board Post 142 of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM HIRTH ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Missouri Farmer written by William Hirth, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, and entitled "If This Be Treason," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS ON NEUTRALITY BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Misleading Issue of Neutrality," delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ASPECTS OF WAR IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY JACQUES MARITAIN

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Europe Is Already Saved" written by Jacques Maritain and published in the magazine Commonweal, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY JOHN B. TREVOR, JR., ON AMERICA'S ATTITUDE TOWARD EUROPEAN CONFLICT

[Mr. FRAZIER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John B. Trevor, Jr., first

vice president of the Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc., on October 9, 1939, relative to pending neutrality legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS ON NEUTRALITY BY MAJ. AL WILLIAMS

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of neutrality by Maj. Al Williams on October 12, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PERMANENT CROP CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM NEWS

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Birmingham News of October 13, 1939, on the subject of permanent crop control, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho obtained the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there is an amendment pending, but I desire to submit a proposed amendment and have it printed and lie on the table. I will formally offer it after the pending amendment shall have been disposed of. The amendment is very short and I ask leave to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the amendment? The Chair hears none and the amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PITTMAN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) Neutrality Act of 1939, viz:

"Strike out all of that portion of subsection (a) of section 7 after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21, commencing with and including the word 'Provided', down to and including the word 'involved' in line 11, page 22, and substitute in lieu thereof a period after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the amendment a statement explaining it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement presented by Mr. PITTMAN is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PITTMAN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) now pending in the Senate:

"Strike out all of that portion of subsection (a) of section 7 after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21, commencing with and including the word 'Provided', down to and including the word 'involved' in line 11, page 22, and substitute in lieu thereof a period after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21."

The existing law, which was adopted in 1937, reads as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any belligerent state or of any state wherein civil strife exists named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, or of any faction or asserted government within any such state wherein civil strife exists, or of any person acting for or on behalf of any faction or asserted government within any such state wherein civil strife exists, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, faction, asserted government, or person, or to solicit or receive any contribution for any such government, political subdivision, faction, asserted government, or person: *Provided*, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of funds to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of funds is made on behalf of and for use by any person or organization which is not acting for or on behalf of any such government, political subdivision, faction, or asserted government; but all such solicitations and collections of funds shall be subject to the approval of the President and shall be made under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.



"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of the President's proclamation.

"(c) Whoever shall violate the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued hereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or agent thereof participating in the violation may be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(d) Whenever the President shall have revoked any such proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 of this act, the provisions of this section and of any regulations issued by the President hereunder shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation."

The House of Representatives on the floor amended House Joint Resolution 306 by adding to the proviso a limitation on the discretion of the President by inserting the following words: "for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals", as shown in the following proviso as adopted by the House:

*"Provided, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions; the President shall make public every 90 days any and all exceptions granted under this proviso, together with the amounts of credits involved."*

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, acting through a majority, desired further to limit the Presidential discretion and therefore struck out the House amendment and added the following language:

[Omit the part in brackets and insert the part printed in italics]

*"Provided, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section [for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals,] ordinary commercial credits, and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions, but only if such credits and obligations have maturities of not more than 90 days and are not renewable. If any government, political subdivision, or person to which credit has been extended pursuant to the authority vested in the President under this subsection is in default in whole or in part upon any obligation to which such extension of credit relates, no further extension of credit to such government, political subdivision, or person shall be made or authorized under this subsection during the period of such default. The President shall report to Congress every 6 months any and all exceptions granted under this subsection, together with the amounts of credits involved."*

The committee, in view of the fact that the proposed substitute amendment to the House bill will have to pass the House of Representatives, gave some consideration to the action of the House with reference to such proviso. Again the committee considered that the Presidential discretion would be governed by the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States in construing the Johnson Act which contained no such proviso as herein proposed to be stricken out. It being the intention of the committee to require settlement in cash or cash equivalents as defined by the Attorney General, I deem it wise to avoid any confusion or any misunderstanding by striking out the entire proviso.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire at this time to submit for the consideration of the Senate a series of amendments to the pending joint resolution.

The first amendment deals with the credit portion of the measure. It seeks to change the time limit provided for on page 22 of the resolution from 90 days to 30 days. Should that amendment fail, then, I propose a second amendment, dealing with the same subject, to limit the amount of purchases within the 90 days to \$200,000,000. I am informed that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has offered, or will shortly propose, an amendment to eliminate the credit provision in the joint resolution. Should such an amendment prevail, I will, of course, abandon the proposals just submitted by me.

The third amendment deals with the transportation problem involved in the joint resolution. It seeks to exempt the transportation by American vessels of any passenger or any articles or materials other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war listed in the proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 to any place outside the Western

Hemisphere which is not within any area defined as a combat area pursuant to section 3 (a). In short, the amendment simply permits American ships to carry on their normal trade in areas far removed from the danger zones to be established by the President.

The fourth amendment adds a new section and deals with the proposition of amending the Johnson Act. It seeks to broaden the term "foreign government" so as to include all subdivisions thereof, and it is also intended to prevent the sale of bonds for refunding of bonds issued prior to April 13, 1934, by a foreign government in default, except as to such bonds actually owned and held by citizens of the United States prior to said date.

I ask that the proposed amendments may be printed in the usual form and lie on the table, and that also they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER were ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 22, line 1, strike out "90" and insert in lieu thereof "30."

On page 22, line 11, after the period, insert the following new sentences: "In no event shall the aggregate amount of the exceptions granted under this subsection in the case of any foreign government exceed \$200,000,000 during any period of 90 days, commencing with the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this joint resolution. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'foreign government' includes all its political subdivisions, all its dominions, protectorates, dependencies, and possessions and the political subdivisions thereof, and all persons acting for or on behalf of any of the foregoing."

On page 17, line 25, before the semicolon, insert the following: "or to transportation by American vessels of any passengers or any articles or materials (other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) to any place outside the Western Hemisphere which is not within any area defined as a combat area pursuant to section 3 (a)."

On page 18, line 9, after the semicolon, insert "or"; and on page 18, line 14, beginning with the semicolon, strike out through the word "aircraft" in line 18.

At the end of the joint resolution insert the following:

"Sec. 20. The act entitled 'An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States,' approved April 13, 1934, is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter it shall be unlawful within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for any person to purchase or sell, or to act as the agent of another person to purchase or sell, or to act as agent for the collection of or payment of interest on, the bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign government issued after April 13, 1934, or to make any loan to such foreign government, while such foreign government is in default in the payment of its obligations, or any part thereof, to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to the renewal or adjustment of outstanding bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign government owned and held prior to April 13, 1934, by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

"Sec. 2. As used in this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, other than a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress or a corporation in which the Government of the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise.

"(b) The term 'foreign government' includes any foreign government or political subdivision thereof and any organization or association acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, and all governments owing allegiance to the same sovereign or to the same general government shall be considered political subdivisions of the same government and a default on the part of any of them shall be held to be a default on the part of all of them.

"(c) A foreign government shall be held to be in default at any time when it has failed to pay in full any payments of principal or interest due to the United States by such foreign government."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I send forward an amendment, and ask that it may be printed in the usual form and lie on the table, and also that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CLARK of Missouri was ordered to lie on the

table to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amend the committee amendment on page 22 by striking out lines 12, 13, and 14, inclusive.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, it is not likely that I can add much to this debate. It is with considerable diffidence that I rise to speak at all, in view of the able presentations that have been made here by statesmen infinitely better qualified than I, and with infinitely more ability, judgment, and experience than mine. Perhaps, however, I owe to my colleagues, to the people of my State, and, if you please, to the people of our beloved country, the duty of briefly stating here the reasons which impel me to oppose the repeal of the so-called arms embargo.

Considerable criticism has been leveled at the length of time consumed in this debate in the Senate; but, to my mind, the element of time pales into insignificance when we consider the danger of the issue involved, and the far-flung consequences that may redound to civilization itself as a result of our decision here.

I can think of no greater indictment from the future pen of history than to have it write that the greatest deliberative body on earth—the Senate of the United States—hurriedly and heedlessly impressed upon the country and upon the world a program of this magnitude and of this unparalleled importance.

It is impossible to overestimate the far-reaching consequences of what we may do here. Our children and our children's children, even unto countless generations, will reap the reward of happiness or pay the penalty in debt of our decision, based upon these few weeks of debate.

It is so astonishing as almost to beggar comment that at the outset of the debate in the Senate the public mind was so confused as to the real issues involved in this controversy. There was no public comprehension of what the debate was all about. First, the public was led to believe that it was necessary to choose between the repeal of the arms embargo and a system of cash and carry; secondly, there was never stripped and laid bare before the public the real issue, which now has come to light in this debate, namely, that the prime motivating factor is the repeal of the arms embargo in order to help the British and French Empires. It is unfortunate that it has taken 2 weeks of debate in the Senate at least to strip these issues to their true essentials and their elementary fundamentals.

Of course, the groundwork had been well laid; the stage had been artistically set; and we met here, not as a free, untrammelled forum for debate and deliberation, but rather almost as an executive arm of the Government, not to consider a program but to jam through a program. In my judgment, the extraordinary session of Congress never would have been called had not sufficient assurances and pledges been received by those in charge of the pending joint resolution almost, to their minds, to insure its passage. By that I do not mean to impugn the motives, the sincerity, or the patriotism of any Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. If they had sufficiently made up their minds to give a pledge or to give assurance before the session began, it is not for me to put words into their mouths or thoughts into their minds. I can only say that it is unfortunate that the Senate of the United States is almost in executive session, and is not now the free, untrammelled, deliberative body which it has been through the centuries.

Mr. President, the first great issue which confronts the public mind is the confusion between the repeal of the arms embargo and the not inconsistent provisions for cash and carry. At the outset the public was taught that it was necessary to choose one or the other; and even in my own State a glaring example of this occurred. One of our prominent newspapers, published by highly intelligent, patriotic, educated men, conducted a poll of its readers. In that poll the question was asked, "Do you favor the present embargo or do you favor cash and carry?" When an intelligent newspaper—a daily paper, if you please—conducts a poll of that sort, it can be seen how deep into the consciousness of the American

people this terrible confusion has penetrated; and I must say, in all candor, that those who sponsor the pending joint resolution have done little to remove it. I think I may draw an inference from their refusal to accept the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] to segregate these two consistent issues and dispose first of one and then of the other. I think the only inference which may be logically drawn from that adamant refusal to divide the issue is that they still hoped that the public mind would remain confused. But 2 weeks of Senate debate have, I hope, at least brought home to the people of the country what the issue is on that score, and also that they may have the arms embargo and cash and carry, too; and I am firmly convinced that the great majority of our people would like it so.

The debate in the Senate has finally stripped to sheer nakedness the real issue and the only reason motivating those who want repeal of the arms embargo; and the fact has finally come to light that this reason is not that it is a step toward peace, is not that it is a step toward neutrality, but it is rather now, in all candor, admitted by most of those who advocate repeal that they desire it because they affirmatively wish to aid the British and French Empires in the destruction of Germany.

The genesis of this change in heart on the part of the Senate, the genesis of this candor, the genesis of this ultimate frankness, is interesting and instructive to trace.

On September 21 the President of the United States in person, to a joint session of the Senate and the House, delivered his message wherein he sought to justify the calling of the special session and to outline its purpose. In only one paragraph of that message do we find this purpose defined. Here it is:

I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the laws of nations—the embargo provisions. I ask it because they are, in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace.

In the use of the phrase "American security" there may be some slight hint of the real purpose behind the repeal of the embargo, but most certainly in the use of the phrases "American neutrality" and "American peace" there is concealed rather than exposed the true purpose.

I do not question the motives of the President of the United States. I have never, in a public address or otherwise, impugned his motives or questioned his sincerity of purpose or his patriotism. In fact, I have praised him as one of the great Presidents of our country for the good he has accomplished. It was for him to make his decision in the choice of the words "American neutrality" and "American peace," not for me. He has made that decision. But it is a far cry from the words of the President of the United States on September 21 to the able speech, the brutally frank, candid, and devastating speech, made on the floor of the Senate toward the end of last week by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], who now occupies the Vice President's chair, wherein he stated that in his mind, at least, the objectives of the repeal of the arms embargo were not American peace and American neutrality, but were an affirmative act, which he believed in, calculated to aid Great Britain and France in their prosecution of the war.

Soon after the President delivered his address the newspaper columnists of the country immediately began a savage and a justified tirade, demanding that this issue be stripped of all its sham; that the hypocrisy of the Senate cease; that fundamentals be spoken abroad on this floor and the real issue brought from its hiding place and exposed to the full light of day. One by one eminent Senators courageously and fearlessly have stripped this issue to its essentials, culminating in the eloquent and candid and masterly address of the junior Senator from Nebraska last Wednesday.

I presume it will not be seriously contended at this juncture of the debate that there is any compelling reason for repealing the arms embargo except to aid the British and the French Empires crush Germany. That is the sole issue; that is the only thing that can be debated with any degree of candor from this time on.



Mr. President, it is only fair to say that those who advocate such a course do so in the hope and on the assumption that we can nevertheless keep out of war. Even on the assumption that we can aid Britain and France with methods short of war, for my part I submit that we should not do so. I do not believe that Britain and France, with their mighty empires, should be aided by the United States at this time, and I base my thesis in that respect upon two propositions.

First. By categorically, blankly, and with an arbitrary attitude refusing at this point even to negotiate for peace, they have placed themselves in the role of aggressors, and neither deserve our help nor should they have it.

Secondly. If Germany is crushed, 80,000,000 highly intelligent, technically developed, organized people will, as surely as the sun shines, be driven into the arms of Stalin and into the bosom of communism.

So, even if the repeal of the arms embargo were not a step toward war, as I believe it is, I would oppose it on the ground that it would help Britain and France, who now are not entitled to our help, because of their attitude in refusing even to talk of peace, and because the crushing of Germany would build an empire of communism which then would be a threat to the peace and safety of the entire world.

I know that it is very dangerous for a Senator or anyone else to question the altruism and the democracy of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier. I know that when we have felt inclined to indulge in such questioning it has been customary to whisper in closed rooms, among our most intimate friends, and then to glance over our shoulders to see whether or not we are overheard. I know that the results of propaganda have been so devastating that even to question the sincerity of Britain or France has meant laying one's self open to the charge of being pro-Hitler and of acquiescing in the methods he has used.

Mr. President, only last week a distinguished and outstanding American, whose patriotism and whose courage are so firmly established that he needs no defense at my hands—Colonel Lindbergh—made a restrained address, in which he dared to say that he did not want arms and ammunition and implements of war sold to Britain and France. What was the result? The always generous, always able, always kindly chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], in a moment of anger, I know, made this statement on Saturday concerning Colonel Lindbergh:

The most unfortunate part of Colonel Lindbergh's statement is that it encourages the ideologies of the totalitarian governments, and is subject to the construction that he approves of their brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or threat of destruction through war.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Nevada did not really mean that, but I only use it to illustrate the length to which passion and emotion will drive men in questioning the patriotism of those who so much as dare lift a finger of suspicion against the altruism of Britain and France. I quote it to show that I realize that I tread on dangerous ground.

But is it not about time that someone raised his voice to question the modern Tallyrands, Richlieus, Machiavellis, and Henry the Eighths, who are playing their bloody game of chess on Europe's chessboard? Is it not about time that, to some extent at least, even in a feeble way, there should be unmasked the perfidy which hides under the guise of statesmanship and honor? Was the time so long ago that we have forgotten our schoolbook history, from which we learned that the Pilgrim Fathers and the other early settlers of this country fled from England and from France to avoid the bloody persecutions undertaken against minorities there? Was it so long ago that we have forgotten that they built a new government and that none knew better than they the intrigues, the falseness, the perfidy of European so-called power politics?

Those things were not dim memories to George Washington. They were living images to him, and were we even to take slight instruction from his teachings we would not be debating the arms embargo today.

Mr. President, only last week the German Government proposed a conference and a truce. Whether we believe that the

terms proposed were too stringent or not is beside the point. Hitler proposed a restoration of Poland, a true Poland and not a Poland consisting to the extent of 50 percent of Germans, Ukrainians, and Russians. He proposed disarmament, and a truce in the meantime. Yet the proposal met only a categorical "No"; it met only a holier-than-thou, supercilious attitude on the part of the Tory financial oligarchy which today controls the destiny of the British and French Empires.

Mr. President, I say that this categorical, blunt refusal—regardless of what we may think of Hitler, and I do not think much of him—places Britain and France today in the role of aggressors and not defenders. They could at least have made some proposal. Their 70-year-old statesmen could certainly have considered whether they should send British boys and German boys and French boys to their deaths without undertaking, at least in some minor way, to bring about a peace now.

What were the reasons given? There were three. First, Britain and France said, "We are the guardians against the persecutions of religious and racial minority groups in Germany, and we cannot treat with a man who indulges in such persecutions."

Second, they said that the object of the war was to destroy nazism; and I presume that means to destroy Germany.

Third, they said, "We cannot take Hitler's word."

Mr. President, those were the three reasons which they gave to the world for their refusal even briefly to consider a conference which might well end this slaughter now. Those were the three reasons they assigned for becoming definitely aggressor nations.

Let us examine those reasons: First, as to the abhorrence which England now shows for religious and racial persecution, setting herself up as their guardian. I suppose it is a terrible indictment of the human race that religious and racial persecution thrives in the world today. It is a sad commentary upon our intelligence, and upon the civilization of which we claim to be proud, and I suppose that there is not a man who would lift his voice in even feeble defense of Hitler or his methods upon that score. Unfortunately, however, the roots of prejudice grow so deep that even unto our own times there is religious and racial persecution throughout the world, to the world's everlasting discredit. The most notorious examples are Germany, Spain, Mexico, Turkey, and Russia.

It is not so long since the mongrel head of the Ku Klux Klan raised itself to strike here at the same minority groups which we now find persecuted in Germany, and for which some of us would go to war. There was not much of a cry for embargoes against Mexico when one-half of its people was persecuting the other half for religious reasons. And we did not want to go to war with Turkey or to impose embargoes against her when Armenians were being slaughtered by the countless thousands and their nationality destroyed.

No; this holier-than-thou attitude of England today is a pretext and a pretense. Paint me a picture of the 6 years of persecution of the Jews, the Catholics, and the Protestants in Germany, paint it as gory and as bloody as you please, and I will paint you one 10 times as brutal, 10 times as savage, 10 times as bloody in the 500 years of British destruction, pillage, rape, and bloodshed in Ireland. And then I will take from the pens of the British writers themselves a bitter, grueling, devastating history of persecutions in India.

I have just said what I thought of the candid and distinguished speech of the Senator from Nebraska, and I would only ask him, when he decries the religious and racial persecutions in Germany, to go back and read the brilliant orations of his namesake and predecessor, another distinguished statesman, Edmund Burke, made at the close of the eighteenth century before the Houses of Parliament in the impeachment trial of Warren Hastings, Governor General of India. When the Senator from Nebraska speaks of persecutions by Hitler during the last few years and describes his actions as brutal, let him read what his predecessor and namesake, Edmund Burke, said about the tortures, the devastation, and the persecution in India under British rule. Then let him remember that trial of Gov. Gen. Warren Hastings

dragged for 7 years, and English "justice" and English "honor" finally acquitted him.

No; it ill behooves England, it ill behooves France, with the record of persecution of religious and racial minorities even within their own borders, now to refuse at least to treat for peace rather than send their own boys to die because, as they say, and as is probably true, Hitler persecutes racial and religious minorities.

The second point which Mr. Chamberlain now makes in order to justify his sending men to death is that aggression, Nazi aggression, must be stamped out. A splendid motive indeed, Mr. Chamberlain, if we could even begin to believe, in view of your past history or the record of the ruling classes of your government, that you even so much as halfway meant it.

Aggression. The outstanding example of aggression that the world has ever seen is that of the British Empire. This Empire has been built upon conquest, upon aggression, and it is worthy of note, Mr. President, that that aggression has usually taken form against helpless and defenseless peoples. Seldom indeed have British armies been massed against a virile and a prepared people. Only in their wars against France was this so. But always British armies were sent to the corners of the world to prey upon savage, uncouth, and unarmed peoples; and from Great Britain's vast colonial empire, obtained almost entirely by aggression, she has drawn streams of gold from the streams of human blood and human labor that exist there.

England has been at war more than half of its entire history, and only one of those wars could even remotely be called a defensive war.

It is not so long, Mr. President, since British shot and British canister crashed through the very roof of the building in which we deliberate today, and laid this magnificent Capitol building in ruins.

So now, when England, glutted with the gains of conquest of centuries, holds up her hand again and says that she is going to send her boys to death to stamp out aggression, it ill becomes her indeed.

It may be said that is ancient history? By the Treaty of Versailles England and France added by conquest to their already swollen empires 1,000,000 square miles of new territory, a territory 5 times as large as the Poland of which we hear so much, and 20 times as large as Czechoslovakia.

No; the conquest is not ended, and if Chamberlain came into a court of equity and said that he would not talk peace because he could not believe in Hitler's word, that he could not rely upon it, I do not believe he would come into that court of equity with clean hands. So let us not be deceived on that score.

What is the third reason which Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier advance for not wishing to talk peace, but on the contrary for saying that they are going to send their boys to war? What is the third reason? Ah, they say, "We cannot trust Hitler's word." Of course, they cannot, and nobody knows that better than Mr. Chamberlain; and nobody knows better than he knows and the whole world knows that when it has been to British interests the British word and British honor have meant no more than that of one, A. Hitler.

The crowning example of the reason that they cannot trust Hitler's word is given as Munich. They say he said at Munich that if he were given a part of Czechoslovakia he would not make further encroachments upon Europe. He did not intend to keep that word, and hence he lied. But let us examine Munich further.

France and England had a treaty with Czechoslovakia guaranteeing that little democracy against aggression and promising the world that if she were attacked they would aid her in a military way. Yet when Chamberlain and Daladier thought at Munich that for their own interests they could bribe Hitler by breaking their own written treaty obligations it was an easy decision for them to make. They tried to bribe Hitler by breaking their own word first. Perhaps they could have learned a lesson from a famous English jurist by the name of Jeffreys, who sat upon the criminal court bench of England a long time ago. He had

such an odious reputation for hanging criminals and for ferocious justice that he became known as "bloody Jeffreys, the hanging judge of England." But it was noticed that Mr. Justice Jeffreys got rich beyond the salary of his office, and so in his later years, as the legend goes, a friend asked him how throughout all these years he could have maintained his reputation for severity. "How could you obtain the name of 'the hanging judge of England' and yet apparently become rich?" He replied in a simple sentence, "I took their bribes and hanged them, too." So Hitler at Munich took England's bribe and hanged her, too!

Was it a greater breach of faith for Hitler to state that he had no more intentions of attacking Europe, when he knew he had, or was it a greater breach of faith for England and France brazenly to violate an existing treaty? Yet they cannot take Hitler's word!

And Poland! Mr. President, when history is written, the betrayal of Poland by England and France will go down as the greatest "sell-out" of modern times. Not content with betraying Czechoslovakia in the hope that their bribe would stick, they then made overtures to Poland, a nation that was getting along quite well with Germany at that time, and, if you please, with loans and otherwise, enticed Poland into an encirclement program. So they gave to Poland the same guaranty they had given to Czechoslovakia, that they would protect her with their military and naval might. Poland could have granted every one of Hitler's demands a few months ago. She could have returned Danzig, the Polish Corridor, and even upper Silesia without bringing herself to destruction. But, egged on by England and France, depending upon her treaty of military alliance, she refused to do this, and chose invasion instead. I do not justify that invasion. No one can. I only say that Britain and France egged Poland on to it, to her ultimate destruction.

Then did Britain fulfill her second treaty obligation? Did she or France go to the aid of Poland? They did not. I can still remember listening to the radio in the evening a few weeks ago, and hearing that lonely little radio station in Warsaw, after almost 2 weeks of siege, bleating through the air, "We will not give up. We will fight to the bitter end. Our city is in ruins, but we will die." Poland's generals had deserted her. Her President and her Government officials had fled to the sanctuary of another country. The radio announcer said:

We will not give up because we can depend upon the British promise. We can depend upon British honor to come to our assistance.

Mr. President, it would have taken only a brief radio message from London to tell the gallant little garrison in Warsaw that defense was hopeless. It would have taken only a short radio word to tell the mayor of Warsaw that the generals of his army had ignominiously fled, that his country was in ruins, and that he had better not subject his city to destruction and his people to devastating death. But the message never came from French or British honor, and Warsaw was sent to her destruction by British honor and by British promises, in order that its destruction might be used as propaganda to inflame the people of the United States against the aggressor.

Mr. President, I ask, Which was the worst criminal—he who did the destroying or he who sold out to the destroyer? I think history will record that this was the greatest betrayal ever known to modern man. I find support for that view from the pens of two eminent British statesmen, David Lloyd George, and Britain's outstanding intellect, George Bernard Shaw. It is peculiar that we cannot say those things in this country when Lloyd George and Bernard Shaw say them so bitterly in England itself.

British honor. British promises. When Russia came in and invaded half of Poland, where was the British promise to defend her integrity? Not only did she not have the desire or the courage to declare war on Russia, as she had agreed to do, but now, according to her own press dispatches, she is entering into an agreement with Russia to furnish her certain strategic war materials in return for tin and rubber. Explain that if you can. She not only failed to



keep her written treaty obligations and declare war on Russia but actually courted Russia and agreed to furnish her tin and rubber for her implements of war, further to destroy Poland.

Chamberlain says he will not talk peace with Germany because he cannot depend upon Hitler's word. Britain lied to us when she incurred war debts which she never intended pay. She lied again when she told us she could not pay those debts, and yet with the same breath proceeded to spend twice as much in the development of armaments. She first lied to the Arabs in Palestine, and when they became too hot for her she lied to the Jews whom she had sent there. The British Empire is built on two things—blood and treachery. Ethiopia is another example.

Therefore, Mr. President, I for one am unwilling that we should repeal the arms embargo to furnish aid and comfort to England when she has refused even to discuss peace for such sham reasons. I am unwilling that we should become a party to any such proceeding, even if it would not mean war.

But there is another reason, and that is that if the German people should now be destroyed they would have nowhere to go but to the bosom of Stalin and into the communism of Russia. When once German technique and German organizing ability are married to the natural resources of Russia and the doctrine of communism, in only a short time we shall have a communistic empire which will then destroy the French and the British empires, and may even become a menace to us.

So let Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier, if they will, drive 80,000,000 brilliant, educated, hard-working people to the doctrine of communism, and then let us see what will happen. We shall have a peace worse than Versailles. We shall have a peace from which can only come the destruction of democracy in Europe in real truth. Versailles created Hitler. He is nothing more than the red-hot lava belching out of the German volcano. The fires of that volcano were lighted by Britain and France at Versailles. They have created a Frankenstein monster with their own hands, and now they want our aid to help destroy it.

Mr. President, all I have said thus far has been based on the assumption that we can still help England and France with methods "short of war." I do not propose to help them under present conditions, even if that be true.

But is it true? Whether or not the repeal of the arms embargo is a step toward war cannot be either proved or disproved with mathematical certainty. We cannot reduce the future to an algebraic equation. It is all a question of what values we give to imponderable premises. It is all a question of what weight we give to factors which may operate in future. I take the position that repeal of the arms embargo is an inevitable step toward war, but I cannot prove it; neither can it be disproved. I base that assumption upon two premises. We have only our own personal experience to go by, and we have only the experience of the last World War. If those experiences indicate that it is not a step toward war, well and good; but, in my judgment, they overpoweringly prove, if it can be proved, that repeal of the arms embargo is the first step on the road to war.

Mr. President, did anyone ever buy chips in a game of chance without later engaging in the play? Did anyone in his boyhood days ever make snowballs for one side without very soon beginning to hurl the missiles himself? I think not. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has so well said, I think we cannot engage in the occupation of being an armorer for one side without sooner or later being a warrior for that side.

So, if our past personal experience means anything, it means that if we want to keep out of war we had better keep off the threshold of war. The step across the threshold is short and easy; it is not difficult to make. Do you realize, Mr. President, that every airplane, every bombing plane, every bomb, and every machine gun that is sent to England and France to be used for purposes of destruction in Germany will bear the initials "U. S. A." and probably the name of its maker? What do you suppose the German

soldiers will think when American bombs bearing the initials "U. S. A." rain down upon their cities? What do you suppose German mothers will think when they see their sons killed by American bullets?

Mr. President, if we should send American bombers over there for that purpose, if we should send machine guns over there with those letters written on them—and even if they were not so initialed they would be easily recognized—we might just as well put on them also in large and unmistakable print the letters "R. S. V. P.". When we send our airplanes to Germany for purposes of destruction we start in to fight, and from then on, once we have taken the plunge, it is not a question of where the stream is flowing, but only how swift is the current.

In addition to our own personal experiences, we have the experiences that led us into the last World War. It affords a curious study to read about the chain of circumstances which transformed us from a peaceful Nation into a warlike country that was ready to go, and did go, to war. I will not recount them here; but sufficient it is to say that it is beyond my feeble comprehension how anyone can read such books as Mills' *Road to War*, or the expert documented work of Professor Peterson, *Propaganda for War*, and be in favor of repealing the arms embargo, unless he is willing ultimately to go to war.

Mr. President, I have endeavored, primarily, to clear two confusing issues that have existed in the minds of the people of the country: First, that it is impossible to have repeal of the arms embargo and cash and carry at the same time; and, second, that the real admitted issue now is, Shall we repeal the arms embargo in order to help the British and French Empires crush Germany?

With respect to the latter issue, I have taken the position that we should not, even if we could do so, by methods short of war, undertake to aid Great Britain and France to crush Germany for two reasons:

First, they have become aggressor nations by refusing, on sham pretext and pretense, even to consider the offers for peace; and, second, if they should crush Germany, we would have a peace worse than that of Versailles; Germany would be driven into the hands of Stalin and communism, and a communistic empire would arise that might overwhelm the earth.

I have said also that I think to repeal the arms embargo, besides doing these things is a step on the road to war, judging from our personal experiences and from our knowledge of events that led us into the last World War. So I respectfully submit to you, Mr. President, to my colleagues in the Senate, and to the American people, that the embargo should be retained.

One of us is wrong, one of us is terribly, horribly wrong. It will not do for those who are proposing to effectuate the repeal of the arms embargo, if that act should lead us into the war, later to say, "We meant well." This is not a game of checkers that can be lost and laughed at and forgotten; this is not like placing a few coppers on the horse races, which, if they are lost, the bettor can go away and forget. No; this is a gamble of life and a gamble of death. I think that we who oppose the repeal of the arms embargo choose the safer course. I think those on the other side, with their patriotism and with their desire to help England and France, are gambling that repeal of the embargo will keep us out of war, and thereby they are gambling with death. It will not do later, if their gamble turns out to be on the losing side, to say to the muse of history, "We meant well." It will matter us little when we are indicted before the bar of history to plead in defense, "We had good intentions." When some future Dante writes another *Inferno*, perhaps some of us will have a spot there, and in large and fiery letters, if the gamble of those who are advocating the passage of the pending joint resolution fails will be written the words, "They meant well."

I only hope, Mr. President, that in my limited and inexperienced understanding I do not see this issue in its true light; I only hope that I have not been given the light to see the issue involved here as I do see it, because I gamble

on far less than those who advocate repeal of the arms embargo. So, as I conclude, Mr. President, I leave with the Senate just one wish, which is sincere and from my heart, that the proponents of the measure and not I may be right.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in rising to address the Senate at this hour in the progress of this debate, which happens to be the hour of the day when, I know, Senators customarily are at lunch, I am not presumptuous enough to assume that I can change the views of any Senator who has followed the course of the discussion. I feel, however, that a man in public life, carrying a responsibility in connection with legislation involving a momentous decision, owes it to his constituents and to his country to give his reasons for the decision he reaches. That is the purpose of my rising to address the Senate this afternoon.

We have been debating what is called neutrality legislation. It is said that such legislation is necessary in order to keep us out of war. Those who defend the repeal of the arms embargo say they want to keep this country out of war and that repeal will have that effect. Those who take the opposite view make the same profession of intention.

If the main issue is that we shall keep out of war, then, it seems to me, the first question to decide is, Do we want to keep out of war; have we the will to keep out of war? It seems to me that if we have the will to keep out, little legislation is necessary. If a man does not want to commit murder, he does not have to have a law to keep him from committing murder. If he wants to commit murder, he will usually find a way to do it, irrespective of what law has been enacted to prevent murder or punish the perpetrator of such a crime. So I think we ought to look back of this legislation and determine whether or not it is our will and purpose to keep out of war.

It is said, in order to keep out of war, we must be neutral, and so we must have neutrality legislation. So-called neutrality legislation is an act to restrain certain citizens. Private citizens are restrained by the Government in order to keep them from doing certain things that might cause us to become involved in the war.

It is not only the acts of private citizens that may get us into war; the acts of public officials are far more dangerous and far more effective in that direction, because public officials have a responsibility for restraining citizens from committing unneutral acts; and they themselves, as men in authority, have a duty to see that as public officials they so restrain their public acts that they cannot be justifiably accused of being unneutral as officials of the Government, speaking for the Government. We say our citizens may not do this and must not do that. We who sit in places of responsibility must ourselves take that medicine, not only Senators and Members of the House of Representatives but the Chief Executive and members of the Cabinet as well. We must see that we do not take sides if that is what is meant by neutrality.

I have a definition of neutrality. There are many different definitions of neutrality, so I go to the authority to which I have usually gone to find the meaning of any word. I go to Webster's International Dictionary, which defines, in international law, neutrality as—

The condition of a state or government which refrains from taking part, directly or indirectly, in a war between other powers. The right to observe neutrality and the name "neutrality" are both comparatively modern, all persons anciently having been considered as friends or foes—

Of the contending parties.

If that is the correct definition of neutrality—that a nation, to be neutral, must not take sides, directly or indirectly, in a war between powers—then that means that we should not, directly or indirectly, by any public act as a government, take sides in a controversy, and that principle should guide us if we really want to keep neutral. However, on the question of neutrality there seems to be a great difference of opinion. Men in high public places, speaking with the authority of high office, say we can do things against one side in favor of another, and be neutral, and refrain from going to war. I do not understand that kind of language or reasoning. It

reminds me of the definition of "fair" as given by a man having civil litigation. He complained about the rulings of the judge. He said, "The judge is not fair." A man asked him why he thought the judge was not fair. "Well," he said, "a fair judge would be on the right side, and my side is right. But he overrules my attorney's motions and objections, and so I know he is not fair, because," he said, "a fair judge would be on the right side, and my side is right." [Laughter.] That is the definition which I seem to obtain from some persons as giving their idea of neutrality.

I believe we can best serve the interests of the United States by keeping neutral. I know of no other definition by which to measure neutrality than that given by Webster's International Dictionary, stating that neutrality consists of a government taking no sides, directly or indirectly, between two countries engaged in war. While I have listened with great respect to Senators whose personal emotions are with England and France, and have heard them openly admit that they want to take sides and help one side against the other, and while I have no doubt everyone has his sympathies, we are not here to act upon our personal emotions. We are here as public officials to make decisions for the benefit of the country, irrespective of our emotions. As a public official, I do not want on the floor of the Senate to express my personal emotions, because I am not speaking here as an individual. My personal emotions are mine. My public official duties require me to have no emotions and to have no partiality in a controversy except to look out for what I consider to be the best interests of the people of the United States. That is my conception of the duties of a public official.

The technicalities of the embargo, the repeal or the failure to repeal, have been so thoroughly expounded by both sides of the controversy that I am not going to spend any time on that subject, except to say that it seems to me the repeal of the embargo at this time would be directly or indirectly taking sides in a controversy. If we are going to take sides, let us be open and aboveboard about it. If we are going to stay neutral, let us not take sides directly or indirectly with either side. I do not think we have yet come to the pass where we are willing to take sides openly, one way or the other, in an official act. We should not do it by subterfuge.

We have heard a great deal in the past few years about "the duty America owes to the world," the natural urge of the missionary who has heard the propaganda that we must do missionary work in the political fields of Europe, and give Europe moral leadership; that Europeans are so ignorant that with battleships and bombs and bayonets we must enter every controversy in Europe for the purpose of teaching them something and making them as good as we are. I have never had any sympathy for that kind of propaganda. Too much of that kind of missionary work has been done down through the pages of history. Much of the misery in the world it owes to those who, for the good of those they have shot and conquered and mutilated, have done that kind of missionary work throughout the pages of history.

Then we have heard a great deal about the sanctity of treaties—particularly peace treaties; and we have heard a great deal about designating the aggressor and punishing the aggressor. Just what does that mean? If you designate or indict a criminal, it is up to you to convict him and to punish him. Who are aggressors? In the terms of the modern diplomat, an aggressor is a nation which violates a treaty, particularly a peace treaty, because peace treaties are sanctified. They are sacrosanct. They are international law. So peace treaties which have been written must not be broken; they must not be changed; and anyone who by force changes them is an aggressor, and must be punished.

If that is to be our policy, I should like to ask, Where shall we begin, and where shall we end? I should like to know where there is a powerful nation which has not violated peace treaties. Where is there one? Where is there such a nation which has not engaged in international banditry and been an aggressor at one time or another?

If that is to be our policy, we shall have to punish other nations to the end of time. Then we shall find it necessary



to engage in the new war of extermination which we are told is coming, because it is said that one nation is ready to fight a war of extermination to prevent another war of extermination. If they do not succeed in exterminating all, then it will be up to us to determine who is the aggressor and go and exterminate the aggressor. I do not understand that line of reasoning.

Every treaty of peace—treaties which are called so sacred in history—has always carried within it the seeds for the next war. There is nothing sacred about them. From the beginning of time that has been true. The Treaty of Vienna, the first and second treaties of Paris after the Napoleonic wars, the treaty of 1870 after the Franco-Prussian War—all these were based upon a sadistic urge upon the part of those who conquered to punish and mutilate the conquered.

We do not have to go across the water to be reminded of the sadistic urge which has taken possession of conquerors. All we have to do is to sit right here at home and read the history of what the North and the Congress at Washington did to the Southern States after the Civil War. This country has not to this day recovered from that sadistic persecution. While General Grant offered terms of surrender which were humane, the politicians in Congress were as cruel to the South as though they were dealing with savages, and this country has not to this day recovered from the effects of the treatment of the South by the Congress at Washington, controlled by the North. That is one of the blackest pages in American history; but all wars have kindred results.

We have now before us in the world the inevitable result of the last treaty of peace, the Treaty of Versailles. It is hard for some people to believe it, but statesmen in Europe realize it very well. A year ago I visited six countries, and I found the statesmen in every country admitting that most of their troubles at that time were due to the Treaty of Versailles. They said, "Adjustments have to be made. We hope we can make them peacefully. It costs something to have peaceful adjustments of these matters, but it will not cost as much as war; and we do not want war." Well, they have it now.

The Foreign Secretary of Belgium stated, after they severed their connection and renounced the Treaty of Locarno, that he could not risk the safety of his nation upon the theory of the Treaty of Locarno. The Prime Minister of Sweden about a year ago said that the peace of Europe and the rehabilitation of Europe could only be brought about upon the wreckage of the Treaty of Versailles.

Talk about the sanctity of treaties! We have heard too much of that from people who should know better.

The years 1938 and 1939 were singularly prolific in disappointments and disillusionment not only for the many millions of human beings directly affected but for all those who for these last two decades have hoped that finally mankind would recognize a few of the errors of its conduct and do better.

Twenty years ago those who thought they had won the World War sat down in Paris for the purpose of fashioning a lasting peace, as they said. The Central Powers had been defeated after a struggle that taxed to the utmost the military and economic resources of the allied and associated governments.

It had been trumpeted to the world that the World War was fought to end all war; that it had been waged to make the world safe for democracy and make it a better place in which to live. There was to be a peace without victory. Self-determination was to be the rule thereafter, and minorities of any sort were to be protected against oppression.

President Woodrow Wilson had become the leader in this movement. He realized, no doubt, that these changes would have to be made if the war was not to be lost for everybody. Unfortunately, he took too much for granted. Once the German armies had been overcome, the old brand of diplomacy had the right-of-way again. David Lloyd George had been in favor of the 14 points, which constituted the Wilson program of peace without victory.

Here was an international agreement, the armistice, on which Germany laid down her arms. But after they laid

down their arms no one paid any attention to that agreement. There was a violation of an international agreement. But it was soon a case of "when the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be; when the devil was well, the devil a monk was he." It was so with Clemenceau. Now that the backs of France and her Allies were no longer against the wall, the situation was different.

I am one of those who hold that without the economic and military resources of the United States of America the Allies would not have succeeded in worsting the troops of the Central Powers group. Sane students of human affairs no longer doubt this, though for a while it was a popular claim that the World War was fought by the Allies for the sole purpose of protecting America. For a decade this absurdity made the rounds, and I suppose that even today one could find dilapidated intellects who defend that claim.

The fact is that our getting into the European war, and thus making it a World War, produced a whole series of lamentable conditions.

I may say that if those who are trying to get us into another World War succeed, we will have another series of very lamentable conditions, and I do not believe our economy or our political institutions can survive.

The allied and associated governments won the war too completely, as it were, and in so doing lost it. The way things look now, they would have been very much better off if they had used some sense at Versailles. Instead of a peace without victory, we got victory without peace. Instead of making the world safe for democracy, we made it highly unsafe. Instead of making the world a better place in which to live, we assisted in lowering the standard of living everywhere, our own country included. Instead of protecting minorities by self-determination or otherwise, we seem to have made them the footfalls of dictators. In other words, the whole Wilsonian program was frustrated. The vanquished were stripped of territory at home and abroad, and impossible reparations were imposed. Three empires were dismantled and their fragments fed to the wolves. When the several treaties which ended the World War had been signed, not a vestige was left of international morality and sanity, and the law of the nations. It was, indeed, a case of woe to the vanquished, and to the victor belong the spoils. The law of the tooth and claw was supreme, as it always has been in international relations. This, despite the fact that the solemn covenant of the armistice under which the Central Powers laid down their arms promised an entirely different peace.

Who, today, talks about the sanctity of the armistice agreement? Who talks today about the 2,000,000 who died from hunger in Germany, because of the starvation blockade put into effect by the Allies in order to compel Germany to sign the treaty of peace? Yet the sacred promises made to the Central Powers on November 11, 1918, were disregarded as though they had been a scrap of paper. The bad faith that was Versailles had its beginning when the real promises of the armistice were discarded by the powers that offered them a pledge. Versailles became a torture chamber in which the language of the armistice agreement was mauled and twisted until it was made to sound as though the final wording of the treaty had been what was intended all along. That may have been the intent of some, but it was not that of the armistice, which America had helped bring about. Before we condemn those who, we say, have violated a sacred treaty, let us remember where this unholy business began.

It is not my intention to take up the time of the Senate with minute details as to what effects the several World War treaties produced. The effect was entirely negative in every instance, producing the very opposite of what the high signatories expected and what the defeated signatories promised under duress. However, I must point out that there was no disarmament on the part of those who disarmed the Central Powers, even though they themselves had agreed to disarm, and no indication that a revision of the "peace" treaties in question would ever be undertaken. It cannot have escaped my colleagues, of course, that finally territories were retaken by those who lost them; that armies were called into being in defiance of the peace treaties; and that a rather complete

revision of certain of these peace treaties was undertaken without the high contracting parties having so much as a comma of say in the matter. I think that is quite clear by now. I am inclined to think that there will be more of this as we go along.

What was the basis upon which the several World War treaties was rested by the Paris Peace Conference? For the greater part, it was a series of secret treaties, of which President Wilson seems to have remained ignorant until he made that first unfortunate and ill-advised trip to Paris for the purpose, I take it, of seeing to it that this 14-point program was not overlooked.

We have here the secret treaties, of which we were not informed when we entered the war, although the evidence now shows that they were in the State Department all the time. When Wilson came back from his first ill-advised trip to Paris he said he did not know anything about those secret treaties until he arrived at Paris. I suppose those treaties were as sacred as other treaties of history. Of course, Wilson went over to see that his 14 points were not forgotten when the treaty was made.

All these secret treaties were held from the knowledge of the world until after the war was ended. The fact is that much of Europe, Africa, and Asia had been "allocated," which is a beautiful term to be used for robberies of that sort. I am simply recalling this part of history in order to show that nations travel over the same ground, that history repeats itself. While we think we are facing new problems today, as a matter of fact we are only emphasizing the statement of Heine that the only thing humanity learns from history is that it cannot learn anything. So we do not recognize the same symptoms of disease when they appear from time to time.

Then the League of Nations was formed as a holding company for so-called mandates. Great Britain was to have her share of the loot; France was to get her share out of the war for democracy and for international justice; and Japan got her share. It was taken away from her at the disarmament conference later, but she is getting her share now without any opposition from her former allies in the World War. Serbia waxed fat as a consequence of the murder of Sarajevo; Rumania passed into the possession of territories to which she had not the least historical, economic, or cultural claim. Here and there new states were created by throwing minorities into their laps. All in all it was the same old story.

The making of treaties of many sorts was incident to this. First of all the delegates of the defeated powers signed on the dotted line without having had a say in what they signed. Their signature was simply a mea culpa, which is polite Latin for "I am guilty." They could not do anything else. Their women and children were starved by the blockade. Therefore they had to sign. Certainly they were guilty of some things, but they were not the only ones who were guilty.

Next came a whole series of treaties that created states where none had previously been, and finally this orgy in ink ended in dozens of treaties that were to insure throughout all time the new conditions thus created. Treaties and alliances, military conventions and commercial agreements grew like mushrooms after a warm rain of a summer's night, and over this mass production of understandings presided, with much aplomb and dignity, the now moribund League of Nations, which we had the good sense not to join.

The League of Nations, as the refrigerator in which the plans of the "peace" treaty framers were to be preserved forever, was no great success, due to the fact that human life is a thing in flux and must remain that, if mankind is to be as happy as its many limitations and handicaps permit.

They forgot that, after all, humanity is made up of nothing but human beings who may from time to time change their minds. Conditions change, so they change their minds, and governments change their policies with changed conditions. But that treaty was to settle the peace and the boundaries of the world forever. They made provisions that under cer-

tain conditions there could be revision; but, of course, nobody paid any attention to that.

There was one thing the League of Nations could not do. It might well serve as the repository of treaties made directly and indirectly under its auspices, but it was powerless when it came to making the defeated powers toe the mark in the long run. So long as the interests of the bosses of the League held to parallel courses all was well. But a day came when the tides of time changed in many parts of the world. The League had no means for the enforcement of the treaties that had been hatched under its auspices. Its leading members forsooth set out on piratical courses. There came into existence such a thing as the "unofficial" or "undeclared" war. Of all the hypocrisies of which the human mind is capable, this is the culmination, the very fruition of deceit and malfeasance.

Of course France had a terrific war to reduce the Riffs in Africa, whose country was given to her to upbuild and to civilize under the mandate; and she civilized them, not with a Krag but with the weapon used by the French Army—I do not remember its name. However, it was not the Krag with which we "civilized" the Filipinos. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of it all is that governments the world over have found it expedient to recognize this new departure in international turpitude by giving it the stamp of their approval, by not insisting that a state of war is a state of war, no matter how it began. Of course we have found a remedy for that also. We generally do so. We simply refuse to recognize the conquests made as the result of "undeclared" wars, which no doubt makes a lot of difference to the poor devils involved.

Naturally there has been much talk about treaties while all this went on. For instance, we hear a great deal about the sanctity of treaties and pacts, and many seem to be in the habit of almost losing their reason when such an agreement is violated by one of the contracting parties. What we all too often forget is that treaties at their best are but mile-stones in history, documents showing that on such and such a date two or more governments came together for the purpose of recording something on which they were in agreement. One of the parties agrees under duress. On the other hand, not a few treaties have been conceived and written in deceit.

Of treaties, pacts, conventions, and the like we have a great variety. The only ones worth the paper they are written on are those which regulate commercial relations, and this for the reason that they deal with tangibles and confer mutual benefits. The commercial interests they represent and foster belong to the realities of life and are cared for by people who are in the habit of dealing with concrete facts of trade and industry. Very often investments are based on commercial treaties, and a large measure of business honesty and common sense enters into them for that reason. But this is more in the consular than in the diplomatic department of foreign relations. In course of time I have gained the impression, however, that the real diplomatist is not greatly interested in commercial treaties, because making them is rated as humdrum and lacking glamour.

The treaties that have brought so much misfortune to man are those of peace and alliance. The peace treaty, be it bilateral or multilateral, is usually an instrument that shoulders upon the vanquished the burden of defeat. It follows, then, that the one who must accept the conditions of such a treaty will do so only until he is strong enough to refuse doing so. Of this we have seen a great deal during the past years in Europe, and we probably shall see more of it during the new year soon coming. To expect that such a treaty will be honored long beyond the day on which the vanquished were obliged to sign the treaty is to live in a fool's paradise. To be sure, such a treaty may contain some provision as to its revision in the future, but the one who imposed the treaty is not likely to rush that date. The one who had to take what was handed him will consider himself competent to break that treaty on the day on which he feels that his state of servitude is over. With the return of his potency comes quite naturally



a desire to free himself from the bondage the peace treaty in question imposed upon him.

Much the same has to be said of treaties of alliance. Governments, like men, make new friends, and there is always the inclination to exchange the treaty of alliances with a weaker power for similar treaties with a stronger one, even if this should ultimately result in fighting against the very government and people with whom one was formerly allied.

The World War saw several such examples. In matters of that sort necessity knows no morals, especially such necessity as is represented in furthering the public interest by getting a share of the spoils.

While we talk about international law, international justice, and so forth, we know that in the last World War the chief powers were bidding for neutrals, one against the other, to join them. Certainly history indicates that those who got the biggest price went where the biggest price came from. I am not saying that we got anything out of it. We did not go in under the same circumstances. They did not have to pay us anything. We paid for the privilege of going in, and we are still paying, and will continue to pay for generations to come.

Much of the story of mankind consists of accounts of treaties of peace and alliance being violated. Historians generally condemn the practice. But it must be said for our chroniclers that generally they are not practical men. Very often they are idealists; more often, indeed, they are half-baked intellects and mere scribes who copy the records of the past without exercising judgment. From that fact has come the universal notion that treaties of any sort are sacrosanct. To put such documents upon so high a plane is both puerile and dangerous. Usually, a false sense of security is born of that practice. Treaties, of course, are very impressive. Loaded as they are with bombast and sententiousness, they impress the public far beyond the reasonable. They have been known to cause much loss of sleep to legislators, because men in high places are not immune to believing finally the fairy tales they relate.

Where is the statesman who does not contemplate his latest effort in treaty-making with a great deal of awe? To make as many treaties as possible appears to be a passion with every diplomat. Every new treaty of which it has been my pleasure to learn was not only the very latest improvement upon all treaties that went before but it was really the only thing of its kind. When it comes to discovering the obvious, diplomats simply cannot be beaten.

It were well to remember that diplomacy and treaty making are an old business.

There is mention of an ambassador in records dating back some 6,000 years. It seems that the person of this august man was not as well respected as it should have been. There is mention of other diplomats at about 2960 B. C.; and, finally, we learn the names and mission of two such high dignitaries in the twenty-first year of the reign of Pharaoh Rameses the Second. Tarte-Sebu and Rameses, the ambassadors of the King of the Hittites and the King of Egypt, respectively, negotiated a treaty, to last forever, for their principals. The original text of the treaty in question was engraved upon tablets of silver. But these disappeared during the ages. Luckily, the text had also been cut twice into the walls of an Egyptian temple. Being of worthless rock, this medium fared better. We owe to it a better understanding of international relations and affairs in ancient times. Its counterpart has since then been found in a clay tablet on the site of the old Hittite capital.

The treaty is general in its nature, and is now a little more than 42 centuries old; but it is hardly necessary to point out that it did not bind the high contracting parties too long. We do not know just when the wars between the Syrian coalition and Egypt were resumed. However, we see that before long the King of the Hittites, named Kheta-Sar, and Rameses the Second were at it again. At a later day Rameses the Third continued this war, and thus provided posterity with as fine a hymn of hate, known as the Battle of Kadesh, as antiquity and our own times could well produce. Some scribe of the Royal Egyptian Government certainly outdid

himself when he penned this remarkable screed, though it is possible that some of the copious output of the World War scribblers is better. To tell the truth, the Battle of Kadesh appears to me to be lacking in "pep." The worst adjective I found in it, and, before me, M. Champollion, the famous French Egyptologist, whose translation I consulted, is the wild word "abominable." After all, even the Hittites must have found that rather soft.

Be that as it may, the text of the treaty in question is remarkable enough to get a little attention from us. It shows that even now, after 42 centuries, there is very little new even in diplomacy and international relations, contrary to what the world believed when the big four sat down in Paris two decades ago really to do something about it.

The treaty is dated "in the city of Pa-Ramessumery-Amen, Tybi 21, xxi." For instance, there was to be "open diplomacy openly arrived at." Grandfather appears to have been an institution in both Egypt and the land of the Kheta. Both Rameses and Kheta-Sar have their respective august fathers and grandfathers mentioned, and then express the pious wish that the supreme deities of both Egypt and Kheta "will prevent the coming of enmities forever." The treaty goes on to say that "there shall be good peace and brotherhood between them forever" and their descendants and successors to their thrones. It is agreed that neither of the contracting parties shall make raids upon the territories of the other, and that they shall refrain from invasion and looting. It is then provided that the terms of an older treaty made between the Egyptian and Hittite rulers of preceding years shall be continued "and performed in an equitable manner." It is a typical Locarno, or League of Nations treaty.

Next comes the clause of military alliance. The Egyptian government shall come to the aid of the Kheta in case they are attacked, and vice versa, though the king of either nation need not personally enter the conflict, if he deems that course desirable. In that case he need but send his soldiers and chariots. Failure to do so, continues the document with considerable naivete, would make Rameses angry. The rulers of the Hittites had the same privilege, of course. This shall also apply to cases in which frontier tribesmen are the offenders—a rather far-seeing proviso when we consider that the boundaries of both Egypt and Kheta were rather far-flung, and for this reason, in many cases, were more easily reached from military bases of the allied country.

The next condition of the treaty is that the subjects of each ruler shall not be allowed to transfer their allegiance to the other. This appears to have been a desideratum of the greatest importance, for it is immediately followed by the most solemn engagement, with appeal to the deities, that this provision is to be strictly kept. What it all amounts to is, of course, that the many races then peopling Palestine were in the habit of making free with their allegiance when there was gain in it. Rameses and Kheta-Sar simply hoped to make their borders permanent in this manner—borders which, as already indicated, were formed by the districts of Palestine and Syria, inhabited by people who were neither Egyptian nor Hittite, but had been brought into the folds of the two empires for their own good, naturally.

Extradition was next provided for. Persons fleeing from the land of Egypt or from that of the Hittites were to be surrendered upon demand. "But," continues the treaty, "no criminal action is to be raised against them." The houses of such were not to be destroyed, nor their wives and children; nor were they to be slain, nor in any manner mutilated, as by "removing his eyes, or his ears, or his tongue, or his feet." Nothing being said of the man's hands, it is possible that these were exempted. The practice of cutting off hands was quite popular in those days, owing to the lack of penitentiaries in which malefactors could be kept from doing further harm.

The many "forevers" shown in the treaty did not last any too long. A tablet at Medinet Habu in Egypt shows Rameses the Third receiving the severed hands of Hittites slain in battle. Even the marriage of one of the daughters of Kheta-Sar to Rameses the Second, she becoming the favorite wife of the Pharaoh under the name of Neferu-Ra, could not produce

"amity forever" between these two great powers of antiquity. It is unfortunately true that nothing planned by man outlasts his necessities, or what is all too often mistaken for them.

Since then many such treaties have been made, of course. A cursory examination of history shows that since this treaty some 1,500 international engagements of that sort have been entered into and in due time violated. It is well to remember that treaties, like municipal law, depend upon concepts of morality and material considerations that may change overnight, and that peace treaties and alliances are subject to the hazards of human existence. Powers that find it of advantage to hold such agreements sacred do so, of course. Communities that find them a burden in the end lose no time in breaking them. We also point to the fact that governments are not in the habit of making treaties of any sort with groups whom they have subjugated and whom they hope to incorporate permanently in their realm. Treaties are made only with those whose power is not entirely spent, and with those of whose obedience one cannot be sure in the long run. When such covenants are sugared with a promise that revision is to be undertaken sooner or later, the one who imposes the hard conditions of a treaty admits frankly enough, though involuntarily, that he is exacting more than is reasonable. Even the most superficial survey of diplomatic history in ancient and modern times establishes the fact that more wars of conquest were terminated without treaties than with treaties. The conqueror simply took what he wanted, and the conquered waited until their opportunity had come. Whether peace treaties or other agreements, also known as scraps of paper, figured in this process, does not seem to be so very important after all. The principal good that comes from such treaties appears to be a gain for the historian. Generally the causes of wars would have remained a mystery had some peace treaty not afterward disclosed what they were. For instance, there has been much controversy as to the origin of the so-called World War. This and that claim has been advanced; this and that party to the conflict has been held solely or largely responsible for this terrible conflagration, the smoke and soot of which is still in our eyes, and the ashes and dead embers in our shoes.

What that war was fought for is made quite plain by the Treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, Trianon, Neuilly, and Sevres. In those treaties Germany was dismantled, Austria-Hungary dismembered, Bulgaria trimmed down to the bone, and the old Ottoman Empire thrown to the dogs. We have no reason to think that peace treaties imposed by the Central Powers would have been better. The treaty negotiated by Germany with Russia at Brest-Litovsk certainly indicates that the Allied and Associated Governments would have been in a tight jam had the war ended in favor of the Central Powers' group of belligerents.

I cannot agree with those who have said that if Germany had won the war there would have been a more just peace. I do not know of any government which, after a war, would write a just peace. I put them all in the same basket when it comes to writing treaties and playing the game of diplomacy. It is all a poker game, in which they deal from all sides of the table, both the bottom and the top, and behind one another's back.

The plain, unvarnished fact is that governments go to war for a purpose, and this purpose is gain—gain at the expense of the government, country, or people against whom they war. Despite all the treaties made—and they would run into the thousands were all the smaller treaties included—the process of international relations and affairs has always been what I have here indicated.

As already stated, treaties are simply milestones on the roads mankind has traveled. In addition to throwing light upon the status of things that brought them into existence, they record what statesmen, if they were honest about it, thought of matters on a certain day. The moment conditions changed, the attitude toward the treaty was bound to change. We need not take it for granted that deceit invariably played a role in this change. Governments change in personnel and policy, and the public interest of a state is hardly ever the same for long. That treaties are violated,

then, is simply a deplorable incident in the life of nations and governments. However, it is regrettable that in many cases nations and governments continue to see an asset in a treaty that has been rated a liability by the other party. This anomaly appears to have been in the mind of George Washington when he advised this Nation to keep away from entangling alliances, by which he meant, of course, all alliances. It is hardly possible that this far-seeing man overlooked that treaties of any sort, or alliances of any type, are entangling.

That the course of international relations of the United States has been so singularly smooth during the century and a half of the Republic's existence is undoubtedly due to the advice of its first President having been much heeded in the past. Of course, we have had our slants and pet aversions among the nations; undoubtedly there have been many "gentlemen's agreements" that influenced our conduct, but we have in the past steered clear of alliances that would have plunged us into wars not of our own making.

I am not one of those who hold that we would have stayed out of the World War had the principal members of the Central Powers group used a little more common sense in their dealings with the American Government. But we still have every reason to think that it would have been much more difficult, if not entirely impossible, to have dragged us into that war had the enemies of the Allies exercised more judgment from the very beginning. I realize how potent the effect of propaganda can be. On the other hand, it generally takes more than sentiment to induce a people to risk its welfare for the sake of a kindred aggregation of people. In such matters mankind is foolish rather than altruistic.

It is hard to tell at this moment what the near future has in store for the human race. The outlook is poor enough, even if the picture should not be as black as it is painted. The propagandist is busy again. Passion once more is being roused as in the days of the World War, and it is not to be overlooked that this time the interested publicist and propagandist has much more and much better material for his purposes than he had beginning with 1914. It would be very difficult to defend the conduct of certain men in this country.

We have another scrap of paper to refer to, the peace Treaty of Versailles and its associated instruments of the same nature. But with any of these we should not concern ourselves. They never had public recognition in this country. They were rejected along with the Covenant of the League of Nations, of which, fortunately, we never became a member. It would be the very crown of folly for us to grow excited over something we disowned 20 years ago. I say disowned, because those who directly and indirectly took a hand in getting us into the World War were more than willing in 1920 and later to have us scrap Washington's foreign policy in favor of a "holy alliance," the League of Nations, that was more unholy and futile than any other similar effort that preceded it.

Mr. President, we should not overlook that present conditions in Europe and much of the world elsewhere are distinctly the product of the peace treaties, so-called, that ended the World War. The conditions in Germany to which so many object were conceived in the Treaty of Versailles and hatched finally in the harsh treatment given the prematurely born Weimar Republic. Had the high contracting parties of the Treaty of Versailles and the authors and bosses of the League of Nations possessed a little common sense, they would have realized that what this puny infant of a republic in Germany needed was an incubator and not the lash of reparations.

The hateful persecution of minorities now going on in Europe is undoubtedly the fruit of the seeds of hate engendered by the majority at Versailles and spread in the fertile soil of the oppressed minorities by the administration of the treaty. These cruel persecutions we abhor now in others, and rightly so. We do abhor these things as emphatically as the American people and their Representatives in the Senate abhorred and repudiated an effort to make us a party to a covenant of oppression that would threaten western civilization and jeopardize the sovereignty of the United



States. We abhor no less the dictatorship theory of government that makes these purges and religious and civil persecutions possible and are determined that such theories shall not find root on American soil.

Had common sense ruled Versailles, all of mankind would probably have been spared much worry and trouble; billions of dollars spent for armament after a war that was to end war could have been put to better use, as the billions of dollars some want us to spend for war in Europe now could be used to much better advantage than to try to help Europe out of her difficulties. Had that money been spent here, we would have made this country a better place in which to live. Democracy, instead of being now beset by many powerful enemies, would have gained in the German Republic a fine pillar of strength against the wall of bolshevism in eastern Europe. However, there were bitter-enders everywhere to play into the hands of the smart alecks; there was too great an audience that enjoyed seeing the bull in the German arena baited by those who collected the gate receipts of reparations.

The net result was precisely what far-seeing men and women said at the time it would be. With the Weimar Republic discredited, Germany had no choice but to turn to some form of dictatorship. It was simply a question which way to turn—toward communism or fascism, since a return to the monarchy would probably have led to a continuation of the peace Treaty of Versailles by military means, just as the World War was continued in the same treaty by diplomatic means.

Under the same treaty there has been an economic warfare. As a matter of fact, the war really never ceased. While fighting ceased economic war has continued until the present time.

I do not believe it can be successfully denied that the failure to revise the Treaty of Versailles is responsible for the rise to power of Hitler in Germany. The Allied governments and other signatories to the League of Nations had promised revision of the treaty, but failed to do so.

That promise was violated by those who say they are fighting to preserve the sanctity of treaties. The provisions of the treaty imposed on the people of Germany and the suffering enforced created such a condition of suffering among the people that a fertile field was created for the spread of communistic propaganda. The communistic theory of government had made such advancement in Germany that by 1932 the Communists polled about 6,000,000 votes out of a total vote of 35,000,000, in which 12 other political parties competed.

In that election, the National Socialist polled not quite 12,000,000 votes, giving that party in combination with the National Party a majority of the Reichstag, and the union of these two parties for the control of the Reichstag caused President Hindenburg to call Hitler to power as Chancellor. Both the Communist and the National Socialist Parties were pledged to a revision of the Treaty of Versailles, and for fear of communism the other parties combined with the Nazi in opposition to the Communists.

In 1931, when Hindenburg was president, there was a coalition government under Bruening and Dr. Breitscheidt, the social democrats and the center party. Law after law was passed by the Reichstag giving the president more and more power from time to time and authorizing him to issue decrees having the force of law. Of course, the Reichstag passed such legislation giving more and more power to Hindenburg because they knew he was a good man; they knew he would not abuse that power. So delegating more power to the president to meet various crises that might arise, the foundations were laid for Hitler when he came into power to grab the power that had been given to Hindenburg. Because Hindenburg was such a good man, and people trusted him and knew he would not abuse power, they gave him power, but the trouble is that human beings die, even presidents and diplomats, and sometimes they make mistakes. The Reichstag of Germany, in my opinion, made their first mistake when they started to delegate more and more power to President Hindenburg. That was in 1930 and 1931. So we have war in Europe now. Is there a lesson for us here?

Of course, it is easy to look back; but I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that from the very beginning there were men, not only in the United States but in France and England, who denounced the Treaty of Versailles and predicted the dire consequences that would follow the enforcement of the treaty. Very distinguished men in England, even some in France, and some in the United States, took that position, but they were not listened to. If these things could have been foreseen by those who would not see and would not listen, the revision of the Treaty of Versailles could easily have been made; and had the allied powers shown an earlier willingness to revise the Treaty of Versailles peacefully, most of Europe's present difficulties might have been avoided. Two years ago such willingness on the part of the Allies was quite apparent when they accepted reoccupation of the Saar Valley and the Rhine frontier. All these changes have been made since Hitler came to power. Had anything like the same willingness to compromise been shown the puny German Republic when it was struggling for its life, it would have gained the prestige so necessary for it to remain in power. With that prestige the crisis which brought the Nazi Party into power would not have occurred.

Diplomats and statesmen must learn that a people cannot be forever coerced, as history many times has proved. Statesmen seem to have never understood that change and growth are a law of life that they cannot repeal.

I deem it necessary to warn my countrymen against lending a willing ear and mind to propaganda that is now being carried on. The Treaty of Versailles had to be broken if it was to be revised. That much is clear; that much was demonstrated by the very governments which now have so much to say on the subject.

After all is said and done, two decades should suffice to show whether or not a treaty is fair or, in the long run, feasible. Moreover, let us not overlook the fact that it was not Germany which first violated the parent covenant of which the Treaty of Versailles is merely the bastard offspring. The conduct of a number of other governments, and of the League of Nations itself, showed the way. Strong members of the League began to make war upon weak members of the League. Of course, we heard protests from the League; but these were incoherent babblings that may have delighted the addicts of the League and their myopic friends, but had no other effect. The League was already a very sick man when the Saar Basin was taken by Germany. It has been under an oxygen tent ever since, unless, indeed, it died at Munich without ado and was surreptitiously buried without the usual certificate—which is also possible in this age of shams.

I have given considerable attention to the League of Nations, because its covenant or charter must be regarded perhaps as the major treaty of alliance of all time. For a while, virtually all governments belonged to it, some of them in defiance of their own laws, as our own, which developed the habit of having "unofficial" observers attend the powwows of the Council and Assembly of the League, not to mention some regular attachés permanently connected with the League in defiance of the views of Congress, which were well known.

Of course, nothing is gained by thinking that in this world any nation can live alone. The more contact we have with the world, the better it is. But that contact should not take the form of alliances, or even understandings between gentlemen who consider themselves above the nation's will expressed in law. What we have had in the happy days of our past, and what we again shall have in the happier days of our future, is the fluid foreign policy of being with all nations on as friendly a footing as circumstances permit. Departing from that rule as early as 1914 has already cost us scores of billions; it will cost us still others when the real pensioning begins; and it will completely hypothecate our future if the mistake is repeated, as is now suggested by so many.

To be sure, no well-defined move for ensnaring us with alliances is in the offing at this moment; but that was true also prior to Easter of 1917. For ways that are dark, and

so forth, some statesmen are very peculiar. Let us bear that fact in mind. Just as we failed to "make the world safe for democracy" by ending the rule of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, so would we fail in making the world safe for democracy by ending the sway of the dictators. Also, we should give some attention to the several brands of democracy we are being asked to save. Some of them are good; others are not so good. Our own could stand some renovating, I think, considering that we have on our hands some 10,000,000 persons who find it impossible to earn their own living or who cannot be made to do so, and 20,000,000 on relief.

But I began with peace treaties. I will end with them. What are treaties of peace? If they are anything, they are contracts between parties. The signatories are designated as "high contracting parties." How sacred and binding can they be, viewed from the standpoint of law, equity, or morals?

It is a well-established principle in law that a contract signed by either party under coercion and duress is ipso facto null and void. Only force can keep it binding on the party coerced. It cannot be held sacrosanct in equity or morals, nor in the so-called decent respect of the opinions of mankind.

Why prate of the sanctity of such treaties? Because such contracts or treaties are held legal in international law? Such treaties are international law. That being so, why talk about the sanctity of international law? The question answers itself. Treaties of that sort are dangerous. The subject is one on which hair splitting is not in order. To be sure, we had no treaty of alliance in 1917, so far as the record shows; but many of us were so full of maudlin sentimentalism for the Allies that no formal treaty was necessary. I, for one, doubt even today that the Hohenzollern rulers were ever half so dangerous as their present successors or those who will take their places in central Europe if we again assist in choking the international pig with butter. I am thoroughly in favor of letting those who, by their hatred and avarice, lust of power, and what not, produced the present chaos in Europe, find a solution of their own for the problems that now worry them. In holding that view, I am inclined to think that of all alliances the worst is the one that has not been reduced to terms of writing, because it gives to the more astute of the high contracting parties a power which the finest text in diplomatic French cannot engender.

I have already heard a great thundering from the pulpit, platform, and press anent this so-called new epidemic of making scraps of paper of treaties. There are by now large numbers of sane men and women who believe that the Covenants of the League of Nations and its World Court, and the several treaties that ended the World War, were thoroughly bad. In fact it is generally recognized today. Those who opposed our joining the unholy alliance that terminated the World War on the calendar, but not in fact, have something to be proud of. Those who finally threw off the yoke which the Covenant of the League of Nations and associated "peace" treaties placed upon them, have at least the excuse of having seen no signs anywhere that a revision of those treaties was contemplated by those who flattered themselves with the notion that they were still masters of the show. It is most regrettable that blasting the nefarious treaties that followed the war had to be marred by ugly excesses in persecution; but that need not deter us from rejoicing that nothing came of the peace intrigues that were to keep Europe and much of the rest of the world in bondage of policies born of hate and selfishness.

In closing, I should like to say a word for those who still hold that our getting into the League of Nations would have caused that combination to be a success. One still finds people here and there who "hang crepe" because we did not join the League and its World Court. I suppose one can also find persons who still doubt that the earth is a globe instead of a disk borne on the back of four elephants.

It would be vain to speculate as to what the possibilities would have been had we joined the League, and thus underwritten every treaty of peace and alliance concocted under its

auspices. I shall not waste your time with that. As a major power the United States itself might not have fared so badly. However, we may well doubt that we could have prevented the many violations of the League Covenant of which members of the League have become guilty in the past 10 years. We should have been obliged either to tolerate or to condemn the international banditry that has been going on. Standing supinely by would have cost us a great deal of self-respect, while doing something about it probably would have precipitated us into another expensive war for the benefit of those whose position in the League enabled them to produce almost any situation that fitted into their schemes of furthering their own public interest.

We are holding the bag for nearly \$12,000,000,000 now. That bag probably would be much greater had the urge of well-intentioned but poorly informed idealists again caused us to think more of meaningless treaties than of the exigencies of human life. If international relations can be compared to a barrel made of staves, I am more for gluing the thing than for encircling it with strong steel hoops. The greater the pressure in any container, the worse the explosion when the limit is reached.

To those who look but cannot see—to those who see in Communist and Fascist absolutism nothing more than the perversity of mankind and its masters—it probably is not yet clear that without the World War and its most regrettable results dictatorship of the odious types which now offend them would not have come into being.

We might just as well see this thing as it is. Also, we need not take too seriously this tom-tom thumping concerning the world's remaining democracies. We have recently heard a great deal of democracy in the Western Continent. I suppose we shall hear more of it. In my opinion, democracy anywhere is only relative. These efforts at making the Western Continent seem the very cradle of democracy in these days rather amuse me. Of the so-called democracies, an amazing number in this hemisphere are governed either by a revolutionary family or a political junta. Nor would I maintain without some reserve that the United States, the British Empire, and France and her vast colonial realm are just too democratic for words. I doubt very much that such is the case. Their so-called treaty rights covering concessions in China cannot stand investigation of their origin, purpose, or moral foundation. I am sure you cannot fool the man in the street with that theory so long as he stays away from the influence of both liquor and propaganda.

A contract was signed by our Allied democracies to pay their war debts. This contract was signed, not under duress but on their own terms and of their own free will. If international agreements have any right to be called sacred, as some persons insist, this contract for payment of debts, signed by democratic governments, should be doubly sacred. However, they were dishonored by default. I suppose this was done on the assumption that democracies can do no wrong.

I have touched upon a good many things, because the time may soon be here again when other scraps of paper will fill the air and blind the spectators. We have already been called upon to go to war because one Hitler tore up the "peace" Treaty of Versailles; and this call has come on the ground that all treaties are nothing short of sacred. If that be the case, let us by all means begin this latest crusade of ours by making the rulers of Egypt and Kheta live up to the solemn agreement they made some 4,200 years ago and kept for 40 years. Let us be thorough in this thing by beginning at the beginning.

On the other hand, should this course of action prove impossible to our modern but anciently orthodox diplomats, is it not possible and practicable for them to pursue a diplomatic course to the end that revision or readjustment can be made by peaceful negotiation, as was promised even by those who wrote the Versailles Treaty, and other treaties based on it? An effort has been made in this direction by European statesmen until recently. This seems to have enraged some of our peace advocates, who seem to favor war in order to prevent war. Exchange of billingsgate, of the kind which in this country, as well as others at times, has been on an export



basis, is not conducive to peaceful relations and the sympathetic understanding so necessary to the will to peace.

Peaceful readjustment may cost something. It is certainly worth whatever it costs if the alternative is world war, and the price the sacrifice of our civilization.

Mr. President, in conclusion, and for the purpose of the record, because so much has been said about returning to international law. I desire to quote from Judge Loder, an expert on international law, as I think all will agree. Judge Loder was a Hollander like Grotius. He wrote the constitution for the League of Nations court. He was its first president. He served as president of that court for 3 years, then resigned. I asked him why he resigned. He said he resigned because he had tried to make that court a judicial tribunal, but had failed; that he could not make it a judicial tribunal. He said it was a political tribunal. At the time he told me this he pointed out that the court had taken jurisdiction of the question of the German-Austrian Anschluss in 1931. He said that was a political question, and that a judicial tribunal should not have entered upon and taken jurisdiction of a political controversy.

I asked Judge Loder some questions about international law. He said: "International law changes from time to time. It is a policy. It is not a fixed statute, and it is changed from time to time by those who have the power to change it, whenever it is necessary to do so."

In view of so much being said about international law and the sanctity of treaties in this debate, and on account of so much talk about justice and morality between nations, I desire to quote what Judge Loder gave me as his opinion of justice between nations, and international law. I asked him whether he thought international questions could be solved judicially. He said, "It will never come in your time or mine." I said, "Why?" He said, "Because there cannot be justice and sovereignty inhabiting the same sphere." When we have sovereignty dispensing justice, according to Judge Lauder—and he is right—we cannot expect to have exact justice in international law, any more than we can have it in any other kind of law.

There is one thing statesmen forget, and it is one thing we ought to remember. Life is just a law that is constantly changing, and as poor victims of the changing forces of the universe, we are thrown around from pillar to post because we are nothing but human beings, and, God help us, we must so remain until further notice. But for the life of me I cannot see how we can do the United States or the world any good by mixing in the controversy now going on in Europe. With 20,000,000 people on relief, and something like eight or ten million out of work, it seems to me that the best thing we can do for democracy is to try to make it work here, to show as an example to the world that it can be made to work, and so show people who are living under tyranny, under dictatorships, that there is a better mode of life. It seems to me that in order to do this we must act very soon, because if we do not, I believe we cannot be of much aid to democracy or the peace of the world, and I do not think we can do it by entering another World War. It is my opinion that if we do, and the war goes to a finish, there will be no democracy left, there will be more suffering than now, there will be many times the number of debts, more persecution of minorities, and less civil and religious liberty. I do not believe we can save democracy by a war of extermination even though it is labeled a war to prevent a war of extermination.

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUNDEEN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bilbo	Byrnes	Connally
Andrews	Borah	Capper	Danaher
Austin	Bridges	Caraway	Davis
Bailey	Brown	Chandler	Donahey
Bankhead	Bulow	Chavez	Downey
Barbour	Burke	Clark, Idaho	Ellender
Barkley	Byrd	Clark, Mo.	Frazier

George	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Gibson	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Gillette	King	Nye
Green	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Guffey	Lee	Overton
Gurney	Lodge	Pepper
Hale	Lucas	Pittman
Harrison	Lundeen	Radcliffe
Hatch	McCarran	Reed
Hayden	McKellar	Reynolds
Herring	McNary	Russell
Hill	Maloney	Schwartz
Holman	Miller	Schwellenbach
Holt	Minton	Sheppard
Hughes	Murray	Shipstead

Slattery
Stewart
Taft
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Townsend
Truman
Tydings
Vandenberg
Van Nuys
Wagner
Wheeler
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN in the chair). Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I will say to those Senators who have just come into the Chamber and are waiting for an opportunity to speak, and to those who have business elsewhere and of more importance, that I expect to speak for about 30 minutes, and possibly 40, and no longer.

Mr. President, during my limited experience in the Congress, both upon the other side of the Capitol and upon this side, I have made it a practice not to interject myself or my opinions into the debate on the floor unless I felt that I had something of real importance to contribute, being rather content to do what work I could in the committees and follow the leadership of the outstanding men on the floor in casting the suffrage that has been entrusted to me. Nor would I depart from that practice today with any thought in mind of making a contribution which might influence my colleagues in determining their action with reference to the pending question, but I feel impelled to speak for two reasons: First, because of a pledge to which I shall refer a little later, but principally because I have been greatly disturbed, as I am sure millions of other Americans have, over the development in the past few weeks of what might be designated a war psychology, a war hysteria, which may or may not reach a momentum that will have serious consequences in this country.

A few weeks ago, following the wise pronouncement of the President, people were saying, "We are not going to get into this war." Now they are saying, "I hope we can keep out of this war. I hope we will not be forced into the war."

Mr. President, this country of ours is conceded everywhere to be a peace-loving nation, and, except for one instance, of which we are not proud, every war in which we have engaged from the beginning of our history has been a war for what we conceived to be ideals, with altruistic purposes. But, notwithstanding that attitude on the part of the united people, notwithstanding the antagonism we have to war, the fact remains that since the beginning of our history there has not passed over our heads one generation—counting a generation as 20 to 25 years—in which we have not been engaged in war. Why is it necessary for a people which abhors war as we do to be drawn into it for one reason or for another? What is the explanation?

I may be pardoned if I refer briefly to my own personal experience. Over 40 years ago, as a young man under 20, after the sinking of the *Maine* in Habana harbor and the killing of 265 or 266 American sailors, I took part in the tirade of abuse of President McKinley, then occupying the White House, because he tried to hold the American people in leash and to prevent the outbreak of war. That abuse attained such proportions by the following April that, notwithstanding it tore the heart out of William McKinley, he was forced into war because of the emotions, the prejudices, and the attitude and the psychology of the American people.

Twenty years later, approximately, I again found my war spirit boiling, and I joined in my poor way in the cacophony of abuse of President Woodrow Wilson because he was "dilatatory" in taking the leadership and bringing us into the World War. I said, as no doubt scores of other citizens were heard to say: "Wilson will write another note, as he did to Mexico. He says he is too proud to fight. If we had Theodore Roosevelt in the White House, we would have been in Belgium 2 years ago." I contributed my part to that sentiment and

helped force the hand of President Wilson. The American people demanded war because they wanted war.

Now it is 20 years later. I have reached a point and age where my war blood is not boiling, although today, if it were necessary, I would go into war; I would pledge the services of my boy if it were necessary. But I can see and I can hear and I can feel the psychology that is developing throughout the country. It is contributed to, probably unintentionally—I hope there is no one with soul so dead as to do it intentionally—but whether intentionally or not, there is developing that attitude and feeling on the part of the American people, and we should do something here to change it, to stop it.

Personally, I think the greatest contribution we could make to the country at the present time would be to act on the pending measure in some way as soon as possible. Therefore, I thought I might say something concerning the foundation on which we have reared the structure of so-called neutrality legislation which might be helpful in reassuring the country insofar as I could do so in my very limited way.

Mr. President, in 1917 and 1918 several million American boys were sent abroad to European battlefields. Other millions at home contributed in their way to that war which we were waging together with our Allies in Europe. I do not care what assertions are carelessly made by those who say we were "sold" into the war or that we were dragged into the war; I know that was not the attitude of the men who were participating in the war. They thought they were fighting a "war to end war." We were told that there was a possibility of the Central Powers winning, and that unless we went over there and helped win the war we might have to fight them over here, and that we were going "to make the world safe for democracy."

Let me speak for these boys. It was my duty over in France to read the mail of hundreds and hundreds of these American boys. I know what they wrote home to mother and to wife and to sweetheart and sister. I know that some of it was interspersed with profanity. I know that some of them could not spell. I know that much of it was ungrammatical. But I know that the burden of the letters written home was, "We are making a tremendous sacrifice in order that this dreadful experience may never again have to be undergone by American boys and American girls. I am willing to go through this and make the supreme sacrifice if necessary."

And in reading that mail, Mr. President, I made a pledge on my knees that as long as I drew the breath of life I would never let any opportunity pass for keeping faith with those young men.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I was over there with the Senator from Iowa, and I had much the same experience. I had the same feeling and emotion the Senator from Iowa experienced. And I have the feeling now that the reason why we did not make the world safe for democracy is because we ran out on our pledge to the men who went over in 1917 and 1918. If we had not turned our backs upon the League of Nations, but had set up some machinery to maintain the peace of the world, we would not be in the mess we are in today.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana. And I may say that I am in accord with his view and will refer to it very shortly.

The millions who came back to America and the millions who were here had in their hearts and on their lips two words over and over again repeated, "Never again. Never again. Never again." And that is the burden of what is in the hearts of the American people today. But notwithstanding that unanimity of opinion and hope and aspiration, there was difference of opinion as to how the desire could be attained.

In the first place, we have sought to maintain what we called the freedom of the seas under international law; and we fought four wars—the undeclared war with France, the war with the Barbary pirates, the War of 1812, and the war of 1917—to maintain the so-called freedom of the seas. What we call international law, the volume of precedents

which are flouted and thrown aside when the national interests of any contestant suggest it, was not effective in keeping us out of war. It was evident to the American people that we would have to do something else.

If I may use a homely illustration, suppose I live out in Chevy Chase, with a little boy 10 years old. If on his way to school two of my neighbors were shooting at each other across the street, what good would it do for me to say, "I am an American citizen. My little boy is entitled to go to school. I am a taxpayer. I support that school. Go out there, son, and go right up that street." It would be ridiculous to maintain such an attitude.

The American people knew that they would have to maintain some sort of policy other than reliance on international law, and two schools of thought immediately developed. One of them maintained that neutrality could be secured by international cooperation, coordination, and action. I belonged to that school then; I belong to it now; and I believe ultimately that school will come into the ascendancy in the thought of the Nation.

The other school of thought says, "That is the very antithesis of neutrality. It makes us automatically a party to every dispute in Europe or Asia, whether we want to be or not. We cannot participate unless we are willing to go the whole length. Consequently, you cannot develop any thought that is more unneutral in its effect and purpose than international cooperation."

That school of thought had the support of a large majority of the American people; and in 1920 the American people went to the polls and cast a ballot between the two schools of thought. The one which I supported was overwhelmingly defeated. That expression of the people then became a mandate from the people on the Congress of the United States to translate into law a national system of neutrality which would be effective against our involvement in future wars.

One of the saddest commentaries on the Government of the United States—on you, my Democratic colleagues, and you, my Republican friends—is that for 15 years after you received that mandate not only was a system of national neutrality not evolved, but, so far as I know, no measure to carry out that view, that plan, and that philosophy was even introduced in the Congress of the United States.

In August 1935, when I happened to be a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the first comprehensive plan of national neutrality legislation was proposed.

Mr. President, I may say today some things that hurt, but they are from my heart. It is said that there were peculiar coincidences. Perhaps the thing to which I shall now refer is a coincidence, but if it was a coincidence it was the first of a long series of the most remarkable coincidences that history records of action proposed in the United States parallel with action taken by certain foreign countries.

At that time Italy and Ethiopia were engaged in war—an undeclared war so far as Italy was concerned. England feared for her life-line through the Mediterranean. England, through the League of Nations as it was then constituted, proposed the imposition of sanctions on Italy because of her conflict in Ethiopia; and Italy did not care a snap of her finger. The things that were vital to her were oil, gasoline, and motor fuel; and she could turn, and did turn, to the United States.

Then the proposal was made—and I know what I am talking about, Mr. President—that in our neutrality law, which then had a hearing, we limit the amount of gasoline that might be purchased in this country by a belligerent to the percentage of motor fuel which that belligerent purchased in peace time, which in Italy's case was 6 percent.

We were notified that if we passed that type of legislation Italy would consider it tantamount to a declaration of war. Let me quote from the esteemed chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. PITTMAN] on April 19, 1937, on this very matter:

For instance, during the Italo-Ethiopian war Mussolini declared that the placing of an embargo by the League of Nations upon the export of oil to Italy would be deemed not only an unneutral but an unfriendly act, attended with grave consequences. In fact, he



clearly indicated that he would consider such an embargo a *casus belli*. At the time this matter was under consideration by the League of Nations, when the President indicated that he was considering bringing about an embargo upon the export of oil to both of the belligerents, Mussolini communicated to our Government that he would consider such an act both unneutral and unfriendly. This whole incident was packed with the most sensitive explosives of imminent war.

And we backed up and rewrote the Neutrality Act.

At that time there was a marked difference of opinion among Members of Congress as to whether we should have a mandatory embargo or whether we should have a discretionary embargo. Those who were in Congress at that time will recall the difference of opinion. The American people were convinced that if we were to have a national system of neutrality it would have to take into consideration four factors which, rightly or wrongly, were considered as having influenced our drifting into the last war.

The first was the travel of American citizens on belligerent ships, such as the *Lusitania*.

The second was the sale of munitions.

The third was the extension of credit of belligerent nations.

The fourth element was the chances American citizens took in trying to run blockades established under international law by other nations.

The neutrality law which we finally put on the books appeared to take into consideration those elements which we thought had militated against us in forcing us or urging us or influencing us into the war.

The result was the Neutrality Act of August 1935, which we put on the statute books, and which was a compromise between the mandatory-embargo people and the discretionary-embargo people. Some of us League of Nations men, the international-cooperation men, said then, as we say now, "It will never work because it cannot be effective equally. We are willing to go along and help you write a neutrality act that will attain the goal which you hope it will attain. We will do everything possible to write into the law that sort of provision and that sort of element. We will go along with you"; and we did. But within 2 years we amended the act twice in very vital particulars, and we are now proposing to amend it again. I venture to prophesy—nobody cares what my prophecies may be, but I venture to prophesy—that it will be back in Congress. No legislation for national neutrality can be so written that it will apply equally under all circumstances to all conceivable belligerents. It cannot be done.

Then we wrote into the law what is euphemistically called the cash-and-carry provision. Some of us then maintained, as has been maintained so forcefully on this floor, that there is no logic in embargoing the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to a belligerent and selling the same belligerent the scrap iron, steel, and cotton which are necessary in their manufacture.

In my opinion, that argument is absolutely irrefutable. It cannot be controverted.

When that provision was written into law, where was the eloquence of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. PITTMAN]? Where were the scintillating pyrotechnics of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]? Where was the disarming candor of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE]? Where was the calm persuasiveness of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]? Where was the cool, incisive, and almost convincing logic of the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH]?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. If the Senator will take the time to read my remarks in 1937, I think he will understand where I was. I very frankly stated that I was voting for the joint resolution because it was the overwhelming opinion of the Congress that it would be of some help in keeping us out of war, but that I did not believe it would, and that I believed that in 2 years we would be back amending it.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very, very glad to learn that I was mistaken in the instance of the Senator from Washington and to know that he took that position.

But where was the flaming steel of the musketeer from the Wabash, the Hoosier d'Artagnan, at that time? With the exception of the Senator from Washington, every one of the men whom I have mentioned was joining in approval of the so-called cash-and-carry provision, which would prohibit, after the President had so proclaimed, the shipment of these other materials that might be utilized in war except after divesting ourselves of title.

In that connection I should like to quote again from the Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who said in the same speech to which I have referred:

No one has seriously opposed the imposition of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

Mr. President, I have been considerably exercised over the "boxing of the compass" done by a good many editorial writers and columnists in expressing opinions on this matter, and I am going to take the liberty of quoting from a well-known columnist—I will even go so far as to mention her name—Miss Dorothy Thompson. I may say, not with reference to Miss Thompson alone but to others, that they may be described by the couplet of Hall Caine:

He sits in a sea-green grotto, with a bucket of lurid paint,  
And he paints things as they isn't, for the god of things as they ain't.

Miss Dorothy Thompson said:

Under its terms wartime commerce is rigged in favor of the great monopolies, international industries, and international banking houses, as against the smaller manufacturer who keeps his capital and employs his labor at home. The bill also will extend to the President very great power of deciding anywhere in the world what constitutes a state of war. \* \* \* The bill, furthermore, definitely favors, in wartime—

Now, listen—

definitely favors, in wartime, that country or those countries which can control the sea, extending to it or to them special privileges which other belligerents cannot enjoy. It also extends special privileges to those nations, or their nationals, who hold credits in this country, or operate industries or exploit natural resources here. The bill is called a neutrality law.

It is not a neutrality law.

Now, what does this bill actually mean in practice? First of all, it means that we are flagrantly reversing the attitude expressed in the Kellogg Pact, which denounces aggression. We, the greatest, strongest single nation on earth, announce by inference that there is no such thing as "right" or "wrong" among nations and no such thing as international morality. In advance of all possible hostilities we perform the greatest Pontius Pilate act in history.

We are proposing to reenact that law, and Miss Thompson, I believe, is ardently supporting it. I have no objection to her supporting it or to her or anyone else changing opinion on the matter, but I wish to digress here to call attention to some statements in the debate on this floor in which the illogic of the position of checking the sale of materials has been referred to, particularly as being inimical to the weaker nations and helping the aggressors.

There is nothing we can put on the statute books that is more unfair to a victim of aggressors than the so-called cash and carry which is now proposed. If it had been in effect at the time of the Italian-Ethiopian war, Ethiopia could not have gotten anything, whereas Italy could have obtained anything she wanted.

If it had been in effect when Germany first invaded Poland, Germany could have gotten anything she wanted, and Poland could not have obtained a thing. If it had been in effect at the time Czechoslovakian rights were infringed, Germany could have gotten anything she wanted and Czechoslovakia could have gotten nothing. If it should be enacted into law now, Latvia, Estonia, and Rumania and none of the other weaker states could get a thing.

Further than that, if it becomes a law after the proclamation of the President, it will be put into effect against China by a declaration of war by Japan. If that should happen, China could not get one solitary thing because she has no

factories in which to manufacture and fabricate war materials. It would shut her off from the one source she now has.

Incidentally, I may call attention to the fact that there is now on the high seas traveling from a port on the Pacific coast an American ship carrying Dodge trucks and Curtiss airplanes to the Chinese. One such ship has already docked, and the one to which I refer is on its way. If the pending joint resolution had been the law and a state of war had been proclaimed, that shipment could not have been made.

Nothing greater by way of premium could be paid to an aggressor than the enactment of this measure.

The candor of some of our colleagues is refreshing. I have seen a kaleidoscopic phantasmagoria of suggestions as to attitudes toward the present war in Europe. Several proclaim that nothing is further from our intention than to pass an act in the interest of Great Britain and France. Others, such as my friend at my right from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] and my estimable friend from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who coached me for the first few months I was in this House, very frankly say they favor the pending measure because it will be of assistance to Great Britain and France. No such purpose should animate anyone—and I say that in all fairness to the Senators to whom I have referred. I know how sincere and earnest they are. The fact remains, however, that some are trying to write a law for the one definite purpose of assisting some nation or nations other than the United States. As the Senator from Nebraska suggested, in response to my question to him, he hoped that that would not be the case, but he was thinking of present circumstances and the effect on the people of Europe. What of the effect on millions of noncombatant men, women, and children in China in the horrible war that is continuing there? Whether we intend it so or not, the pending measure will be applied there.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, if it is not agreeable, but I have been greatly impressed and greatly moved by him, and I merely want to bring his attention to the Ethiopian war, and to remind him that Haile Selassie was not crying out against the cash-and-carry plan. The thing he was crying out against was the embargo. He said "you placed these embargoes on, and they operate in favor of the man who is coming down here with a stiletto at my throat, and I cannot get a gun with which to defend myself." He was crying out not against cash and carry but against the embargo.

Mr. GILLETTE. I was not familiar with that, and I am glad the Senator has suggested it. I know, however, in the State Department and in the Foreign Relations Committee of the House that the message was presented to us that Italy would consider it tantamount to a declaration of war, and we receded on that account.

Mr. President, I said that I would take 40 minutes. I have taken longer possibly than that, although I have not followed the clock as, perhaps, I should have done.

One Senator asked me before I rose to my feet if I was going to speak for or against the bill, and I told him "yes." [Laughter.] Some of the genial young men in the press gallery have been very insistent, as have radio commentators, in calling me and asking me whether I was for or against the repeal of the embargo. Answer "yes" or "no." These gentlemen are always energetic and always enterprising and sometimes even thoughtful in the matter, although not often. Those questions cannot be answered by me now. If I am asked if I will support the measure as an aid to England, France, and the democracies against Hitler, I will say, "I will not." If I am asked if I will vote for it to get us partly into war and to keep us from fighting a future war, I say "I will not." If I am asked, "Will you vote for it to stop Hitlerism?" my reply is "I will not."

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE. If the joint resolution clearly would help China resist the aggressions of Japan, then would the Senator support it?

Mr. GILLETTE. I would not.

Mr. BURKE. That is very definite, I think.

Mr. GILLETTE. But if I am asked, "will you support the joint resolution because you believe it will give the United States of America greater security against future involvement than the present law," I will say, "I will." That is where I stand; that is the only question in my mind; and the final form of the joint resolution will determine it. I believe, that it has elements of greater security.

Perhaps I am in the position of the Shakespearean character who said:

A plague o' both your houses.

Nevertheless, I cannot follow the logic of my colleagues here who say, "We must repeal the present embargo and then put on these other restrictive measures"; nor can I, in all candor and seriousness, follow the logic of my friends over there who say, "It is absolutely necessary to retain the embargo before we do anything else." I cannot follow them.

Let me use another homely illustration. In my State we used to have prairie; and in an early day the settler had to protect his plowed ground and his crops from the grazing animals. Later, we passed a law which said, "You men with cattle will have to put up a lawful fence. A three-wire fence is a lawful fence. You will have to put up a fence of that kind and restrain your cattle." But later, as we developed out there, it was found that the hogs got out, and did more damage than the cattle did. Then we proposed an amendment to the law to make it "hog-tight," and requiring a hog-tight fence to be erected as well as a three-wire fence. What sense would there be, Mr. President, in taking a position in which we cannot make the law hog-tight by putting a 24-inch wire here and leaving the three wires there? Or what sense would there be, let me ask my dear friends on the other side, in saying, "We must retain the other act, regardless of what is put on it?"

I cannot go along with either. I am interested in knowing whether the measure that we enact into law at the conclusion of this debate and the action of the House will go further toward keeping faith with my comrades to whom I have pledged my poor efforts than that which is on the statute books at the present time.

Now I desire to direct attention to two amendments in connection with the joint resolution. If they are enacted into law, if they are embodied in the joint resolution and it is not changed in any other serious respect, I will support it.

The first has reference to the cash-and-carry provision. An eloquent and able columnist, who has a large following, said that the pending measure will prohibit the sale of a toothbrush by an American citizen to a citizen of a belligerent except for cash on the barrel head. He said it in an article in which he purported to explain the joint resolution. He said it was high time that the confusion in the minds of the public should be dissipated, and in the article he made the statement that not even a toothbrush could be sold to a citizen of a belligerent except for cash. There is no provision of that nature in the joint resolution. The joint resolution simply says, practically reenacting the language of the old cash-and-carry provision which expired May 1, that no articles shall be transported from this country until we have divested ourselves of the title to a foreign nation, a foreign corporation, a foreign company, or a foreign individual. There is no suggestion of cash, no limitation on credit from 5 to 50 years or any amount of credit the purchaser can secure; but in the section relating to financial transactions there is a prohibition of the extension of credit beyond the 90-day period to a government, a subdivision of a government, or an agent of a government. In the joint resolution, from one end to the other, there is not a single thing that will prevent the Vickers Co. from sending over here and buying a million rifles in their individual capacity and getting all the credit they want. We may say to them, "You are going to



resell them to the British Empire?" "Why, yes; that is our intention, but for profit. We are not acting as agents of the Government. We are acting for profit."

The first amendment I propose is to close up that loophole, through which, as I see it, a furniture truck could be driven, so as to limit the extension of credit to persons other than agents of foreign governments; to prohibit private concerns from coming over here and buying on unlimited credit, for resale, arms, ammunition, and implements of war from which we have raised the embargo, if that shall be the outcome. If my amendment is adopted they can still buy materials that have peace uses under the provisions of the joint resolution, but the transaction will be limited to a cash transaction. A government, or the agent of a government, may still have 90-day credit.

The second proposal I have offered by way of amendment, which I think will materially improve the joint resolution and close another door, relates to the prohibition contained in the last neutrality law, and which is practically reenacted in almost the same language in this one, in the section referring to financial transactions, prohibiting the flotation and sale in this country of the securities of a foreign government, based on one of the four points to which I referred a while ago which we thought involved us in the last war, namely that by dealing in the securities of one of the belligerents we have a financial stake in its solvency which might induce us to take sides. I do not think it is so, but that is the plan behind the legislation.

At present there is a prohibition which makes it unlawful to sell or float in this country the securities of a foreign nation or subdivision thereof issued after the date of the President's proclamation. Of course, the obvious purpose of that limitation is to avoid confiscation. If one has a vested interest in a security, he ought not to be placed in a position in which it is unlawful to dispose of it. But there is nothing in that provision which prohibits the Government of England, the Government of Germany, the Government of France, or the government of any other belligerent from issuing a new series of bonds after the date of the proclamation, and calling in from their own nationals or from Argentina or some other country bonds of a former issue, with the bait of an increased interest rate, or something of that kind, and using them as a basis for transactions in this country.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Surely.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator knows about the Johnson Act, does he not?

Mr. GILLETTE. Surely.

Mr. PITTMAN. No bonds or other securities of Great Britain, France, or Italy have been floated in this country since the passage of the Johnson Act, have they?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that is true.

Mr. PITTMAN. What securities has the Senator in mind that might be renewed?

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that I am not in a position to list any securities. I am simply saying that if there were outstanding in the Argentine, in Brazil, or among the British commonwealths, securities of belligerents which had been issued prior to the date of the Presidential proclamation, there is nothing to prevent the issuance or flotation of a new group of securities to purchase the older ones and using the older ones as the basis of transactions here in the very way that belligerent nations are definitely and directly prohibited under the joint resolution from using a new issue here. Whether or not that would be done, I do not know; but I want to close every door. The amendment I have offered would prohibit that unless an American citizen had secured and held a vested interest in the security prior to that date.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this measure deals only with belligerents, does it not? Does the Senator want to deal with neutrals?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. PITTMAN. As a matter of fact, the Johnson Act absolutely stopped the flotation in this country of any more bonds and other securities—

Mr. GILLETTE. In the case of the nations indebted to us; yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. By all of the countries now involved as belligerents.

Mr. GILLETTE. It does not blanket in every nation that might be involved.

Mr. PITTMAN. Would the Senator object to the British Government paying the debt it now owes us?

Mr. GILLETTE. On the contrary, I should very highly approve of it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Would not the Senator want the matter left open, so that they could adjust the debt if they wanted to do so?

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say to the Senator that that is a noble motive and a consummation devoutly to be wished, but I am afraid it is altogether too fanciful for my conception.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then the Senator would want to say that there could be no adjustment by any belligerent of debts which accrued prior to the Presidential proclamation?

Mr. GILLETTE. I certainly would have no intention of doing anything of the kind.

Mr. PITTMAN. What does the Senator mean to say?

Mr. GILLETTE. Neither do I believe that the proposal I have offered by way of amendment would do that; and, of course, I expect to present it more fully when it is called up on the floor.

I started to refer to this subject just before the Senator from Nevada came into the Chamber, and said there were two amendments that I expected to call up for debate and consideration by the Senate. I will say to the distinguished chairman of my committee that if there is any vital objection to either one I shall be glad to know it and to recede from my position.

Mr. PITTMAN. The clause to which I think the Senator has reference, which was adopted at the time of the Johnson Act, if I recollect aright—it certainly was included in the 1937 act—provided that the prohibition against extending further credits or floating obligations should not apply to the adjustment of prior debts.

Of course we had in mind the fact that there were debts incurred prior to that time—in fact, the ancient war debts—which some of us would like to adjust. We should be glad even if the debtors would admit their liability by the issuance of new instruments. We did not want to foreclose the possibility of collecting several billion dollars in our effort to make the debtors pay cash from now on. I think we are making them pay cash from now on, so far as the Government is concerned, particularly by virtue of the amendment which I offered earlier in the day, striking out any discretionary power whatever. We are doing that, I think; and I do not believe the debtors can get around it by any subterfuge of which I am aware.

Of course, if the Senator wants that provision to apply to nationals of the debtor countries, that involves another question. In that event the provision would apply to the purchase of our cotton and our wheat. That is a question on which the Senator can speak more ably than I can.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Nevada, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I will say again that I have offered the amendment in all good faith and in the belief, as a friend of the pending measure, and in the hope that it will close up what I conceive to be a hole in the joint resolution. If there is no hole there, I am merely deluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the war debts are concerned, I think it should be said that neither the Johnson Act nor the pending joint resolution, in my judgment, changes the act of Congress under which the war debts were refunded. It is provided that there can be no readjustment, and no acceptance of a smaller amount than that carried on the face of the obligations, without the consent of Congress. So that neither the war-debt act nor under the proposed act could anybody except Congress by an act of its own agree to accept a smaller amount or to readjust the debts again. Therefore,

I do not think the question of the war debts need enter into anyone's fears with respect to either the Johnson Act or the pending joint resolution.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator, and I hope what he has said is accurate. That, of course, will be a factor in determining the question when the amendments are presented.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not want to consume any of the Senator's time, but I do desire to ask one question.

Mr. GILLETTE. I gladly yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was saying that unless his amendment was adopted foreign governments which have outstanding obligations, as in the Argentine, or elsewhere, would issue new bonds and take up the old ones. How would that help?

Mr. GILLETTE. They could use the old bonds. There is no prohibition against using anything, except an issue of a date after the date of the proclamation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assumed the Senator was going to make that answer.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. What prevents their now selling the old bonds, in the Argentine or wherever they are, and getting the cash and using that?

Mr. GILLETTE. Nothing whatever.

Mr. CONNALLY. So what good would the Senator's amendment do? If they have an old bond and it is of any value, they can sell it, in the Argentine or in any other neutral country, and take the cash and bring it here and buy the goods. So how would preventing their exchanging new bonds for old bonds meet that point?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is as clear to me as the sunlight. The whole purpose of the legislation proposed is to prevent our holding securities and dealing in securities of a belligerent, and having a vested interest in the solvency of the belligerent. If it is cash which is coming into our hands, we have no interest in the solvency of a belligerent.

As I stated, I have taken more time than I had agreed to. I desire to close with this statement: No one abhors fascism, and the philosophies and ideologies of Europe similar to that school, any more than I do; but no matter how abhorrent the ideologies of Hitlerism and similar schools, no matter how abhorrent they are to me, no matter how noble the supposed ideals of their opponents, there is nothing more abhorrent to me than the sacrifice of American youth, and there is no nobler or loftier ideal than the preservation of American interests and American security. My vote on the joint resolution—and I am hoping to support it—will be gaged on this and this alone. Does it give promise of greater security than the present act?

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the United States taking any part in the present European war. It is not our war. I am opposed to our taking the first step toward participation in this war, which is not our war. I am emphatically opposed to repeal of the arms embargo. It seems to me there is only one reason that can be offered for repeal of the embargo, and that is a desire to make us unneutral. Repeal of the embargo unquestionably means involvement in the European controversy; it is the first step toward war. That is the main reason why I am opposed to repeal of the embargo against sale and shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to nations at war. I may add that, on principle, I am opposed also to the sale of this merchandise of death to other nations at any time; but that is not the question now before the Senate.

I do not want the United States dragged into the war, or bribed into the war with "cash and carry at a profit," or led into the war by the mistaken enthusiasm of some of our own leaders.

There is just one safe place for the United States in this war and that is in the United States. I am convinced the surest way for us to keep out of involvement is to stay on our own ground and mind our own business, and selling arms, ammunition, and implements of war to be used in this war is not staying at home and minding our own business.

Pin most of the proponents of arms-embargo repeal down to what they really want—outside of a comparatively few,

and they are so few that I do not believe in taking them into consideration in discussing this matter—pin these honest, sincere and frequently jittery proponents down in this matter and they will say they want us to sell munitions of war so we can help the Allies.

Helping the Allies, Mr. President, when the Allies are at war is not the road to our remaining at peace. If our help is to be effective, it must be delivered in sufficient quantities and with sufficient force to assure a victory for the Allies.

If we start helping the Allies by so-called methods short of war, and the time comes when the Allies need more than methods short of war, then we must go the limit and supply more than materials for cash. We will be called upon, under those circumstances, to furnish credits, to furnish billions of dollars of loans, which past experience tells us will not be loans, but gifts, and, worst of all, we must furnish also men.

As I see it, Mr. President, and as I believe the majority of our own people see it, and as the nations of Europe see it, repeal of the arms embargo will be taken to mean that we are preparing to cast our lot with Britain and France in this European war.

At this point I give full credit to President Roosevelt for telling Congress and the people exactly what he had in mind when he called Congress in extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting the legislation now before the Senate.

"Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue," President Roosevelt declared in his message. To that extent I think he stated the issue correctly.

Mr. President, I am opposing primarily the proposed repeal of the arms embargo because I believe repeal of the arms embargo is a definite step toward war and because I believe it would be so understood by our own people and by the Governments and peoples of Britain, France, Germany, and the other nations of the world.

I do not propose to, and most emphatically I will not, take a step toward war. I want to keep the United States out of this war, not push the United States into this war.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to recall to the Senate that in 1937, a little more than 2 years ago, while able to give this matter more calm consideration before the war hysteria was upon us, the Senate passed the existing Neutrality Act by a vote of 63 to 6. It passed the House 376 to 13. The President signed the act, just as he had signed practically the same act in 1935 as a temporary measure.

I also recall to mind that as recently as 1936, while the United States was comparatively calm and sane on this matter of European wars, the President bragged about this act. Especially he bragged about the step his administration had taken to preserve the peace of the United States, and I think he had reason to be proud of it.

In signing the first reenactment of the original Neutrality Act, February 29, 1936, President Roosevelt stated:

By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provided that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war, thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. By the resolution I have just signed the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened until May 1, 1937.

I desire now to quote a statement made by the President in a speech at Chautauqua, N. Y., in the same year, 1936—and I regret to say that he has proved himself a true prophet in this instance by himself advocating the course of action against which he so wisely warned us during the campaign year of 1936. In discussing the existing Neutrality Act, including the arms embargo, the President said—and I believe that I am quoting him correctly:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

It is one of those strange things, Mr. President, that today we find a concerted movement afoot, backed by the administration itself, to break down and evade our neutrality; for, as I stated in the beginning, the plain purpose of this attempt



to repeal the arms embargo is to enable us, at a profit, to help Britain and France by selling them munitions of war.

But let us review another statement President Roosevelt made in 1936. I continue the quotation:

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other thing to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.

That is what President Roosevelt said in 1936. Contrast with that his statement to the Congress of the United States on September 21, 1939—and again I believe I am quoting him correctly:

From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?

That is what President Roosevelt told Congress in joint session last September 21.

We all would welcome, of course, an era of prosperity. But, for my part, I do not want prosperity that is brought to the manufacturers of implements of war used to kill many thousands of our finest young men.

In other words, President Roosevelt warned us in 1936 what those who wanted to break down or evade neutrality would do in case of war on another continent, and in 1939 proves to us that his warning was correct by himself advocating the same thing that he said in 1936 would be done by those who sought to break down or evade our neutrality.

But President Roosevelt warned us against the succeeding step also in 1936; and I continue now quoting from the President's Chautauqua speech:

They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts.

I am wondering just when the President of the United States will send a message to Congress urging that the prohibition of credit extensions will have to be repealed. That probably will be the next step after cash and carry.

Before proceeding, Mr. President, I wish to quote a few more words of what President Roosevelt said in his Chautauqua speech in 1936, in which he urges:

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning, that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

Mr. President, that day is upon us. And the clamor is at hand. My regret is that the President of the United States, who issued a clarion call to all Americans in 1936 to resist the war clamor, now is leading the clamor in 1939, instead of resisting it with the clarity of vision and steadfastness of purpose which he so nobly advocated in 1936.

Perhaps the best explanation of the change of attitude on the part of President Roosevelt is the simple and direct one.

In 1935, in 1936, President Roosevelt was in favor of United States neutrality; he thought he was opposed to the United States taking part in Europe's wars. He wanted peace; he regarded neutrality as an essential part of a peace program.

But in 1937 the President's ideas on the part the United States should play in world affairs began to enlarge. He saw things going on in Europe that he did not like—and in that respect I will say that I myself and most other Americans had no more liking for these things than did President Roosevelt.

But President Roosevelt, who in 1936 saw in neutrality the safe path for peace, and who saw in the arms embargo an effective expression of neutrality at least—President Roosevelt in 1937 felt an urge to meddle in European affairs. He apparently felt something ought to be done about it. He made the famous quarantine-the-aggressors speech at Chicago, thereby serving Executive notice upon Europe that the United States might take part in whatever conflict over there was caused by aggression.

The Neutrality Act, including the arms embargo, had served notice that the United States expected to remain

neutral, and was willing to forego a profitable trade in munitions to do so.

From that time on the United States was bound to pursue conflicting foreign policies.

There was the statutory policy enacted by the Congress, approved by the President, applauded by the President, that neutrality would be the objective of the United States in Old World disputes; that as one means of maintaining neutrality the United States would not allow the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to warring nations in the Old World.

Then there also was the new Presidential policy that the United States had a rendezvous with destiny in Europe, the object of the rendezvous being to join forces with the good nations and against the bad—the aggressor nations.

As plainly it is difficult to maintain neutrality and at the same time take sides, of course it became necessary for the President to work for the repeal of the arms embargo, so that the Presidential urge to help Britain and France could be satisfied without violating the law of the land.

I see no reason for blinking the fact. The purpose of repealing the arms embargo is to enable the United States to help Britain and France—at the start, of course, by methods short of war.

But I must say, Mr. President, that I do not see how we are to help a little when the war is in its beginning and then to refuse to help more when more help is necessary, especially if, in the meantime, we build up a huge munitions industry in the United States, an industry that must depend upon continuing sales of munitions to keep it going.

I do not believe we can enter the war a little way and then withdraw when the war becomes hotter. We cannot, logically or psychologically, be half in and half out of this war, which I repeat, is not our war.

I think more of the United States than I do of any European country. Whatever we do, let us be sure that we are thinking of the future welfare of this country first.

I believe we should endeavor to be realistic in facing this matter.

The war issue in Europe is not humanitarianism, not democracy, not the civilization of the Western Hemisphere.

The war issue in Europe is boundary lines, spoils, or the retention of spoils won in the first World War—and power politics.

Let us not be misled, nor mislead ourselves into believing, that the Allies in Europe are fighting in some unexplained way for democracy, for civilization, for the United States.

You know, Mr. President, and I know this war is rooted in European power politics. It is not a war for democracy—the democracy for which we made the world so safe nearly a quarter of a century ago, when we also fought the war to end war.

We must do our best not to be misled by, and also do our best to counteract all this propaganda designed to lead us into this war which is not our war.

We would not even know who we might be fighting, for or against, if we allowed ourselves to be lured into the present war.

Russia—for the time being at least—is lined up with Germany, although at the same time helping to strangle Germany.

But suppose we entered this war to preserve the British Empire! suppose that Russia decided, after making her western front safe, to carry the war into China; would a Russianized China be a threat to the British Empire? Senators know it would. Moreover, who would be opposing Russia in China? My guess is that it would be Japan.

More than that, Britain would in all probability call upon her ally, the United States, to do its bit in the Orient, while Britain and France carried on the war on the western front. So there we would be, lined up with Japan against Russia in the Orient—and if we won, so would Japan. The difference of course would be that when the war was over we would withdraw from China—but Japan would not.

There are too many cross currents, too much double crossing in Old World politics for us to weather successfully. Before we undertake to run the affairs of the Old World, we might well attempt a better job of managing our own affairs: Ten million unemployed; the expenditure of \$2 for every dollar of Government income; a national debt close to \$45,000,000,000; an agriculture close to bankruptcy—these do not signify we are ready to take over world management.

Mr. President, the advocates of arms-embargo repeal state that they want the cash and carry substituted in the interest of peace. I believe they are perfectly sincere in their position. I certainly would not accuse any American of deliberately seeking the enactment of legislation for the purpose of leading the United States into active participation in the present European war.

The opponents of the arms embargo also assert that they want the arms-embargo provision repealed in the interest of neutrality. But I note that often they couple this desire for neutrality with an even greater desire to help Britain and France—but by methods short of war, of course. In this latter contention I, of course, am in no position to challenge their sincerity, but I must admit that I, myself, am a little incredulous as to the quality of neutrality that includes helping one side in the European conflict, even by methods short of war.

There has not been much said in Congress at this extraordinary session about the necessity of helping, saving, making the world safe for democracy; but there has been a barrage of this line of reasoning, or at least of argument, by other advocates of embargo repeal in the press and on the air. There are many honest people who believe we have a duty to democracies throughout the world; and not a few of these honest people are vigorous supporters of the Monroe Doctrine and would bitterly oppose European intervention in this hemisphere.

I very much fear, Mr. President, that after the arms embargo shall have been repealed—if it shall be repealed—we will hear more of this talk of democracies and civilization. That will come again after the flow of munitions has started; after we have been compelled to extend credits to our European customers; after we have made them loans so they can win their war—their war, not our war—and they have become fearful, and our leaders have become fearful, that if we do not send men as well as materials and money, they will lose their war, and with it will go all the advances we have made.

Most of us can remember a quarter of a century ago when the propaganda was spread broadcast that the same Allies, plus Russia at that time, were fighting to make the world safe for democracy; fighting a war to end war; fighting a war to save the United States that the United States should have been fighting from the start.

We believed that in 1917. Our leaders believed it. Our people believed it. Our young men believed it. No nation ever went to war more unselfishly, more enthusiastically, with higher ideals, than did the people of the United States.

And now we are listening to the overture, these ringing speeches in support of repeal of the arms embargo, for another play of the same sort, say in 1940.

The disillusionment that started in 1919 was a bitter one. The millions of boys and young men, and the billions and tens of billions of dollars that went to Europe to fight for democracy in 1917 and 1918, won the war for those who talked of democracy; but they did not save democracy. In fact, the World War just about ended democracy except in the Western Hemisphere; and today we are being asked to take a step which in my judgment will give us a war dictatorship, at least in the United States.

I am opposed to the United States sending our boys overseas again to complete the job of replacing democratic government with dictatorship all over the world, for, as I see it, that will be the result, win or lose.

Let us save our boys for something better than fodder for Europe's battlefields during this latest of the long succession of wars that Europe has fought over boundaries and power.

I do not doubt that repeal of the arms embargo will be taken in Europe—in London and Paris, Berlin and Moscow—as indicating that the United States is preparing to enter another European war to save Britain and France. Many persons in the United States will feel the same way about it. The war psychology will be materially strengthened by the action we are asked here to take.

That is enough reason to continue the arms embargo, at least throughout the present European war.

I hold that our chances of standing clear in the present European conflict are better if we remain neutral than if we take sides. It will be a terrible mistake, and a most costly one, if we blunder ourselves into an unneutral position. I say this frankly, as one whose sympathies are with Britain and France. If we are determined to go to war, to participate in this war which is not our war, I would naturally prefer that we side with France and England. But I raise the question, Why go to war at all? What would we be fighting for?

What are England and France fighting for today in Europe? According to reports, their leaders are having considerable trouble in stating clearly and concisely just what they are fighting for. If they cannot say, how can we be certain?

Or is it enough for Americans to feel they are fighting for England and France, and that we are to make good the old saw that England expects every American to do his duty?

I am not in favor of repealing the arms embargo because I believe that to repeal the arms embargo is definitely to abandon neutrality. It means that we are going to repeal the arms embargo for the purpose of selling arms and munitions to Great Britain and France. Nobody disguises the fact that that is the object of repeal. Whatever else it is, repeal is not neutrality.

I repeat, Mr. President, that repeal of the arms embargo at this time—even if one believed it to be an unsound policy of itself—cannot be and will not be interpreted anywhere except as an unneutral act. I happen to believe in the embargo.

During times of peace we enacted the arms embargo to make it easier for the United States to keep out of European wars. We are now asked to repeal it so that we may right what we are told is an injustice to one party in the present conflict.

The arms embargo was adopted as a foreign policy for America. We are asked to repeal it for the sake of the Allies in Europe.

I say that our foreign policy should be an American foreign policy, not a British foreign policy, a French foreign policy, a German foreign policy, or a Russian foreign policy. All these nations base their foreign policies on their own interests. Why should the United States base its foreign policy on their interests rather than on our own interests?

As to the question of neutrality, we could have established a cash-and-carry plan instead of the arms embargo at the time we wrote the arms embargo into law, and no question of unneutrality could have been raised.

But now the picture has changed. Europe is engaged in another major war. One side in that war—and I admit it is the side with which the great majority of Americans, including myself, are in sympathy—probably will benefit by our lifting the embargo on the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war.

The direct benefits may be comparatively small, as proponents of repeal point out. We probably will not supply any great amount of munitions, measured against the total requirements of the Allies.

However, the indirect benefits to the Allies may be very large, indeed. In the first place, repeal of the embargo will be understood abroad, and to some extent at home—the understanding at home will become clearer as the months go by—to indicate that the United States is siding with Britain and France, and that the act is being repealed to help Britain and France. In the second place, in my opinion, the sales of munitions will start moving the same chain of events—sales, credits, loans, and finally the



sending of men to Europe to help win the war for those whom we now propose to help by methods short of war.

Repeal of the arms embargo certainly will be an unneutral act. We may just as well be realistic in this matter. Repeal also will open the way for the same series of events, or at any rate a chain of events very similar to those of the previous World War.

Let us go back 25 years and review the history of the financial events that preceded our entry into the World War.

A few weeks after the war started in Europe it was announced by the State Department that loans to any belligerent nation would be inconsistent with true neutrality. This statement was issued in August 1914. By October of the same year there had come a change in policy, slight but determinative. The State Department had been brought to the point of seeing a light. The policy was modified to allow extensions of bank credit, though not loans of money, to be made to belligerents to purchase needed supplies in the United States. We were going to be neutral but help the Allies just a little. We would not lend them money to buy needed war supplies in this country, but we would extend them credits which they could use instead of money.

Less than a year later the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury convinced President Wilson that it had become necessary to allow the Allies to raise money in this country through loans to enable them to protect the credit advances made by our bankers. This was in September 1915.

A month later the first Anglo-French loan of one-half billion dollars was floated; the credit advances of our bankers were protected; and, more important to the Allies, the door was opened for further loans to be made.

From that time on, Mr. President, the United States was committed to giving assistance to the Allies to the limit. We definitely—though not at the time knowingly so far as the great majority of American citizens were concerned—became involved in the World War. As a wise Frenchman, Andre Tardieu, former Premier of France, commented:

From that time on, whether desired or not, the victory of the Allies became essential to the United States.

Of course, in the pending measure there is a prohibition against loans to belligerents. Undoubtedly it is there in good faith. There is a provision that title must be transferred before any materials may be exported to any belligerent. We are told that this is "cash and carry," although there is a little loophole through allowance of 90-day credits, reminiscent of the 1914 prohibition of money loans but allowing extension of bank credits instead.

Suppose, Mr. President, we should start selling munitions on a cash-and-carry basis and build up a sizeable munitions industry. We should have two customers, Britain and France. In a comparatively short time their cash available for purchases in the United States would run out. The question then would be squarely before us. We would have an industry that would be a going concern. It would afford employment and pay dividends. Its profits, wages, and requirements in the way of materials and transportation would have geared other industries into the continued successful operation of the munitions industry.

Suppose our two customers should point out to us that their cash was exhausted. Would we extend credit, or would we close down our munitions industry, with disastrous effects on our entire domestic economy?

Also, we would know that we started the sales to help the Allies. They would then be in worse straits, in more dire need, than when we repealed the arms embargo to afford them what assistance we could without involving ourselves.

The question would then be, Shall we now refuse them any more help when that refusal will mean throwing out of employment thousands or hundreds of thousands of men, and the disruption of our domestic economy, resulting in a minor, if not a major, domestic depression?

Mr. President, there will be only one answer to that question when the question is put. We will amend the cash-and-carry provisions to allow purchases on credit, probably long-term credit.

The next step will be as inevitable as it was in 1915. The credit advances will be such a heavy load for our banking structure to carry that we shall have to allow the Allies to float loans in this country to protect our banking structure.

Then the thing will happen that happened before. The prohibition against loans to belligerents—including the prohibition against loans to nations in default to the United States on previous loans—will be modified or repealed so that we may make loans to Britain and France. Then we shall be just where Andre Tardieu said we were in 1915. I repeat what he said:

From that time on, whether desired or not, the victory of the Allies became essential to the United States.

Further, Mr. President, when the victory of the Allies becomes essential to the United States we must, if necessary, go to war to insure that Allied victory. It seems to me that that conclusion is inescapable. Before that point is reached the United States will be in the grip of a war psychology that will make it traitorous, if not treasonable, for anyone to oppose our going to war.

Mr. President, I have asked that those who favor repeal of the arms embargo be realistic. In all fairness I myself must try to be realistic.

Those who favor repeal argue—and their arguments are effective in many quarters—that the present arms embargo works against Britain and France and to the advantage of Hitler. They argue that Hitler is in no position to buy munitions from us, and that without the arms embargo Britain and France could buy munitions from us. Therefore they say that in order to remove an unfairness toward our own friends we should repeal the embargo to help France and Britain.

Mr. President, if we are enacting neutrality legislation for the purpose of affecting the status of the warring European nations, that is a perfectly good and logical argument. However, it is my contention that we enacted the neutrality legislation for the purpose of protecting the United States from involvement in European wars. We enacted it while Britain, France, and Germany were not at war with one another. It was neutrality legislation then. To keep it now is certainly in the interest of American neutrality.

I think this draws plainly one of the major issues in this controversy over the arms embargo.

It is my contention, and always has been, that our foreign policy should be an American foreign policy—not a British foreign policy, a French foreign policy, or a German foreign policy.

As a part of an American foreign policy, we enacted a Neutrality Act which includes an embargo against the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any belligerent nations in the Old World.

That was written into law for American purposes, to protect Americans against one path leading to involvement in European wars.

As it was written, and when it was written, it was an act of neutrality. It was neutral; not unneutral.

To rewrite that provision now for the purpose of helping Britain and France, to my mind, would be an unneutral act. It would not be neutrality.

More than that, to revise the Neutrality Act for the purpose of helping one side in a European conflict means that we are basing our foreign policy upon European interests; not upon American interests.

I repeat: The foreign policy should be an American foreign policy. Whenever we base our foreign policy upon the interest of European nations, we have abandoned a sound position for what I consider an unsound position.

Of course, Mr. President, if we are to abandon our position of neutrality, if we are to base our foreign policies upon European interests instead of the interests of the United

States, then I will admit I would favor taking the side of England as against the side of Hitler. There can be no question on that score.

But what I am trying to maintain is an American foreign policy as against a European foreign policy. When we abandoned that sound position nearly a quarter of a century ago, we did not help matters much, and certainly did not help our own people and our own Nation.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am opposing, with all the earnestness I possess, repeal of the arms embargo as tending toward embroiling ourselves in the present European war.

I am also against any program of loans or extensions of credit by the United States Government or its citizens to any nation engaged in war.

I am opposed to modification or repeal of the Johnson Act, and I greatly fear that the measure before us proposes to abrogate the wise provisions of that act.

I am very much opposed to the 90-day credit feature of the so-called cash-and-carry provisions of the pending legislation.

Believing that repeal of the arms embargo means but one thing, namely, that we will enter the European war now raging; knowing that the people of the United States feel as I do, that we ought not and must not get into this war, which is not our war, if we possibly can avoid it, I shall continue with all my might to oppose repeal of the arms embargo. When we lift the arms embargo and start selling war supplies, it is almost equivalent to a declaration of war.

I am for a strong navy, a large air force, and adequate national defense that will repel any invader, but not for fighting Europe's battles for any European nation or set of nations.

Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and a half-dozen other countries next door to the trouble in Europe are showing their good sense by keeping out of the war and remaining neutral. Why should we travel 3,000 miles across the seas looking for a fight? I say let them alone.

Mr. President, our Neutrality Act was enacted in the belief that Europe's wars are not our wars. That belief is just as well grounded today as it was 2 years ago, when the Congress enacted the present law and the President signed it. So I favor keeping the Embargo Act as it is. Good sense, morals, material well-being, and devotion to the principles of democracy all sound the warning—"America, stay out."

We have between us and the trouble abroad a great ocean—a natural barrier potentially more powerful than a dozen navies. Our immediate duty to ourselves and our sister republics is to keep on this side of the world and set an example for the other side to follow. We cannot keep the peace by involving ourselves in somebody else's war.

I am sorry I cannot go along with President Roosevelt in his high enthusiasm for the welfare of the entire world, but I believe the Members of the Senate are free men, with the right to their own beliefs and the duty of living up to those beliefs. Furthermore, I am opposed to giving the President more discretionary war powers. I think Congress should remain in session as long as the emergency exists, and should perform its duties as the Constitution requires. I am glad to stay here and do my best to keep America out of war.

I intend to continue to stand for what I believe is best for my country, and that includes keeping the arms embargo in effect indefinitely.

I have my personal sympathies for England and France, but I think vastly more of the United States than I do of any European country. Whatever we do, let us be sure that we are thinking of the future welfare of this country first.

If Europeans are determined to have wars, let them fight their own wars. Our problems are right here at home, not in Europe.

Mr. President, I hope we have learned something from history. Our experience in the World War should teach us that it is a good thing to keep out of European wars. Let us not repeat the tragedy of 1917. We then lost the lives of 126,000 of our finest American boys; it cost us \$41,000,000,000. We got nothing for it—not even thanks. We loaned European

nations \$14,000,000,000, and they still owe us, and will never pay.

While on this subject, what about the rewards we got for entering the World War "to save democracy" and fight "the war to end wars"?

We did not "make the world safe for democracy."

We did not end wars.

We got no colonies; we wanted none. In this respect we differed from the Allies, who took all they could get.

We got "promises to pay" from the Allies whom we financed, as we will finance them again if we follow the course we are being asked to pursue.

How much do Great Britain and France owe the United States today in unpaid debts hanging over from the first World War? Well, the total is considerably over \$9,000,000,000, \$5,497,000,000 from Great Britain and \$4,180,000,000 from France.

Neither nation has made any serious effort to pay. Perhaps neither could pay. But we may as well face facts squarely and realize that if we should enter the present war we would be called upon to lend another \$10,000,000,000, and perhaps more, and saddle that debt upon the American survivors of this latest European conflict.

We also made approximately 23,000 new millionaires in the United States through World War profiteering. The big fellows who make huge profits in wars are anxious to get in the game again. I am opposed, as the masses of the people in this country are opposed, to giving these merchants of death a chance to pile up their millions, as they did before. If this country should supply munitions and armaments to either side it would be the worst profiteer of all—profiting by the death and suffering of millions of human beings. We must not do it. Blood money will bring neither happiness nor prosperity to the people of America.

What good the United States, and in the long run the world, would derive from the intervention of the United States in this war is more or less doubtful.

But here are some things I know the United States would get:

First, a dictatorship.

Second, a further increase in its national debt of tens of billions of dollars.

Third, loss of life running, perhaps, into millions; destruction of property running into the billions of dollars.

Fourth, after the war, a depression worse than the last one; very likely a continuation of the dictatorship; and then some more European wars.

I say we ought to keep these things in mind and stay out.

I say again the way to stay out of the European war is not to take the first step that would lead us into it—repeal of the Embargo Act.

When we start selling munitions we start entering this war, which is not our war, but just one of Europe's many wars; and if we enter one more of Europe's wars we probably shall participate in every major European war from now on.

All that that means, finally, is big profits for the munitions makers, while our own boys are being slaughtered on the battlefields in somebody else's war. I say our young men have the right to their own lives, as against the greed of the profiteers and the love of power by the European war lords.

That is the way I feel about the matter; and, judging from the thousands of letters and telegrams that have been coming to Senators and Representatives, that is the way the great majority of Americans feel about it.

I have received more than 15,000 letters and telegrams since Britain and France declared war. There are at least ten urging that the United States remain neutral for every one that would repeal the arms embargo. The Members of Congress from States clear across the country to California tell me that their mail is preponderantly the same way.

It is very plain to me that the people of this country do not want to go to war for Europe's boundaries. I think that feeling is almost unanimous.

The great majority of our people believe, and I believe, that the sale of munitions will lead us directly into the war.



I believe the great majority of the people of this country—the ones who will have to do the fighting if war comes—want the arms embargo kept in effect. They do not want the Neutrality Act amended to make it less neutral.

I say to you that these people are right. I believe the American people will keep their heads and resist all the propaganda designed to lead us into war.

Again I say, it is not our war. We must not allow ourselves to be stampeded into it. We learned our lesson 20 years ago. We cannot bring peace to Europe by taking more war to Europe; and if we start selling munitions to the warring nations of Europe, then most assuredly we are on the way to sending our boys to Europe again.

Mr. President, it is up to you, it is up to the people of the United States, to insist that Congress reject the pleas to allow the sale of munitions to warring Europe, no matter how eloquent these pleas are, no matter how well intentioned the people who would follow the course that led us to war in 1917, and will lead us there again unless Congress stands firm in this grave emergency.

I cannot help feeling that Europe is the land of the double-cross, as well as of the little white crosses. Why should America go abroad looking for either?

I find myself sympathetic with Governor Bib Graves, of Alabama, who said, "This is not our funeral, and I hope we are not going to furnish any corpses."

When the whole country is aflame, we should not be hasty in taking action. We do not need to and certainly ought not to repeat the mistake we made in entering the previous World War.

In conclusion, let me assure you that I shall protest in the Senate, with all the energy and earnestness I possess, against weakening the Neutrality Act by amendments making it less neutral. I shall insist on retaining the Embargo Act, which will stop profiteering in war supplies.

Before I close, let me say also that I am strong for the insertion of a provision for a war referendum in the Constitution of the United States. I say the men who will do the fighting, and the people who will pay the bills, should have something to say on the question of going into foreign wars.

I promise you right now that as a United States Senator I never will vote ever again to send American boys across the seas to fight in someone else's war, to wallow in the mud and blood of Europe. I say the lives of the American boys are worth more than all the land in Europe they may be fighting over.

I feel more intensely about these things than I have ever felt about any other issue before the Senate.

I pray to God that we shall not repeat the tragic experience of the first World War, and see another generation of our boys killed needlessly and wickedly in another of these wars caused by the political and racial jealousies that have been the curse of Europe for 2,000 years of history.

Mr. President, we should stay out of this war. It is not our war.

We should stay out of this war deliberately, determinedly, and finally.

We should stay out, and we should stay all the way out—not just halfway out.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in the few remarks I shall make this afternoon it will be necessary to refer to two of our colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAFT in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin? Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield for the purpose of enabling me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think no one besides myself is very much interested in what I am about to say.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I heard the Senator say he was going to refer to the remarks of some of his colleagues, and I thought perhaps he would like to give them an opportunity to be present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am pretty sure the colleagues in question know what I am about to say, because I have talked

to one of them. I have not talked to the other; but nothing I shall say will hurt them in any way or hurt the speaker in any way. I am going to carry on in the utmost kindness, merely reciting a story to show how apparently inconsequential things may become extremely important as they affect certain persons in our daily conduct of affairs.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator wishes a quorum, I have no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barbour	Chavez	Holman	Sheppard
Barkley	Davis	La Follette	Stewart
Brown	Downey	McNary	Taft
Burke	Ellender	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Frazier	O'Mahoney	Townsend
Capper	Gillette	Reed	Wiley
Chandler	Green	Schwellenbach	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUNDEEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. SLATTERY answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BILBO, Mr. BULOW, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the order of the Senate just entered be vacated.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, when I was interrupted for the quorum call, I had made the statement that in the few remarks I shall make it will be necessary to refer to two of my colleagues, because the remarks are made for the purpose of correcting the record. There is no unkindness in my heart toward anyone. It may even be necessary to mention that some members of the press are responsible for bringing about the condition that resulted in a misquotation which has done great damage to the cause for which we are here called together and for which we are striving.

Because of this fact, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a radio address which I made on the night of September 11, 1939, and which is supposed to be the address from which these quotations were taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

Since the first Neutrality Act of 1935 became a law its embargoing provisions have been invoked three times. Had the Italian-Ethiopian War continued for a long period and had the attempt to put sanctions upon Italy become general, the American embargo might have complemented the League's sanctions, giving the theory of embargo a test as a war stopper. In the Spanish civil war some of the strongest supporters of the Neutrality Act advocated the raising of the embargo when it seemed to be working too much to the advantage of one side. In the Italian-Ethiopian case many persons charged that the act was a green "Go" light for Mussolini. But the facts do not bear this out, as the things embargoed Italy had plenty of and Ethiopia could not have purchased from us amounts

of sufficient quantity and have got them in time to have affected greatly the outcome. In the Chinese-Japanese War the Neutrality Act has not been invoked. Our actual experiences, therefore, have kept the discussion about America's Neutrality Acts since 1935 in the realm of theory.

Now, today, America finds herself, because of the major aspects of the present war, in regard to the Neutrality Act, in the realm of fact; yet there seems to be but a hazy appreciation of what the realm of fact means. For example, while the President has invoked the Neutrality Act against all of the nations at war in Europe, the act remains uninvoked against the states in Asia. And in addition to that when once war was definitely started in Europe, the President found it necessary to declare our neutrality first under the ordinary rules of international law and war, and then to issue a second proclamation in accord with the provisions of the 1937 Neutrality Act. Thus the fact that America is operating as a neutral does not lessen the complications in regard to theory.

#### ALIGNED WITH VARIOUS NEUTRALS

America finds herself aligned now with other neutrals, neutrals with various shades of meaning and neutrals for different reasons, each interpreting its neutral duties in a different way. For example, as of today, or, I had better say, as of the day I dictated this paragraph, because changes are moving so rapidly that one must speak only for the moment. Russia, Italy, and Japan all have a neutral standing along with us, yet none of these three states has anything like our neutrality law. More significant even than that is the fact that all of them have, or have had, certain very binding agreements with Germany—agreements which now seem to lack definiteness on which to place or venture an opinion on tomorrow's stand. Then we have the neutrality of such a state as Switzerland. Switzerland's neutrality is a forced one. So essential to Switzerland's very existence is her neutral stand that even with her neutrality recognized by all she has found that the presence of the League of Nations and its radio station are probable sources of embarrassment.

The Scandinavian states, the lowland states, the Baltic republics, along with the Balkan states, have all declared their neutrality. Certain South American states have taken action. According to newspaper reports, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile seem determined to remain neutral in the European war, even if the United States should become a party to that war. This is an extremely interesting declaration in the light of what certain South American states did in the last war after we entered it, when they refused to stand on their rights and duties as a neutral as far as the United States was concerned. This action, too, is interesting from the standpoint of our own Neutrality Act, because in it we have declared that the Neutrality Act shall not apply to an American republic or republics unless such a republic or republics are cooperating with a non-American state in a war. For these and other reasons, it is difficult, indeed, to put definite exactness into the meaning of "neutrality" as that word is now used in the world and, for that matter, in the United States.

#### WORTHY OBJECTIVES IN ACT

America's Neutrality Act has behind it definite objectives and these objectives are worthy in every sense. They were expressed at their very best at the time of the discussion of the Neutrality Act of 1935 when our Democratic leader, the late Senator Joe Robinson, uttered the sentence: "We want no war, and we want no profits from war." After 4 years of neutrality legislation, I am convinced that the American people want two things, as these wants are expressed in our present Neutrality Act. First, they desire to reduce as much as possible the danger of any war profits which might involve us in a war, for few Americans want to see America involved in war and, second, the average American wants to see America's economic and moral forces kept in a position so that she may not be a contributor to war or the war maker, but so that she may be able to use her moral and economic forces for peace in the world when the time for making peace comes. There are, of course, tremendous differences of opinion about how best to accomplish these objectives. America's task today then is to produce the type of unity which will cause her to remain uninvolved, and at the same time contribute to the promotion of peace and to the limitation of the war area. We shall soon see whether our Neutrality Act is an aid or a hindrance in the accomplishment of these desires.

The actual working out of the Neutrality Act will furnish the factors making for change or the retention of the act as it is. Upon these factors, too, will depend the nature of the President's recommendations in connection with a special call. Those of us who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee are asked two questions by a half dozen reporters every day. First, "Will there be a special session?" and, second, "Will you vote the same way next time as you did last?" After an actual working of the Neutrality Act the recommendations will of necessity be based upon actual facts and not upon theory as were the last suggested amendments. There is a vast difference between considering an act before the outbreak of war and before the act's invocation, and after a major war comes into existence, and the act has been invoked. Now Congress and the President will act in the face of facts, not of theories.

#### DEFINITE DUTIES AS NEUTRAL

If we can remain objective at all times, unimpulsive in our thinking, if we can live down slogans and the effects of words of uncertain meanings upon our actions, America can remain out of the war, regardless of how severe it may become. America can still maintain, not in the absolute but generally speaking, all of her neutral rights; but we will maintain our neutral rights longer

if we stress our neutral duties and if we sincerely live in accordance with those neutral duties that are now devolved upon us. Those duties are rather definite.

The President's two proclamations, the Neutrality Act and the President's Sunday night radio talk, have all contributed to showing us what are our duties. Nothing will be gained by anyone either within the United States or without if America finds herself involved in war. The good that can possibly come to the world as a result of restored peace will of necessity be the good that will come as a result of a good peace. The more neutrals there are in the world when the time for making peace comes, the better will be the thinking of the world, and the force of the objective thinking will be able to temper the impulses of both the victor and the vanquished.

At the end of the World War, due to the fact that all of the great nations had entered the war, the peacemakers and their peoples were caught between two emotions—one to punish and the other to build a new world order. So strong were these conflicts that it was deemed necessary to join in one document both the punishing elements and the constructive plans. This made universal support for the whole document impossible and caused those who really opposed but a part to oppose the whole. Next time may the neutral force in the world be so strong and so aloof that the victor-vanquished settlements may be confined to those limited problems, and the constructive planning for world peace be left to nations at peace, planning for a peace which will be upbuilding for all, not a peace made by victors.

#### IMPARTIALITY AIDS STRONGER

Now, everyone is interested in the test of our Neutrality Act. If it has defects and therefore needs amendment, those defects will be shown very quickly. The act implies a neutrality based upon the theory of impartiality. I have always held that, while American law always assumed this and text writers have maintained that neutrality meant impartiality, this could not be, first because impartiality could never be obtainable. Neutrality can be proclaimed and lived up to, but try as we will impartiality, even though proclaimed, can never be lived up to. If two nations are contending and a neutral does nothing, the effect of inaction is to aid the stronger of those two nations. If the neutral acts in an impartial way and treats each in exactly the same way, the effect still is to aid the stronger. If the neutral takes sides, he, of course, is not impartial.

Let us make our illustration even simpler: Two men are fighting to the death on a desert. One gains all the water, the other has none. You, a neutral, come along with plenty of water. You say this fight does not concern you because you are a neutral and you stand on your neutral rights and do nothing. From the standpoint of the law of neutrality you have done no wrong, but you have not been impartial. You know that the withholding of the water from the one has meant his certain death and victory for the other.

Therefore, impartial neutrality in a practical sense is utterly impossible. That which is impossible in fact is very poor substance on which to base a rule of law. To the extent that our neutral stands have been based upon impartiality they have been weak. When we have taken the position that neutrality means remaining aloof from war upon the theory that a nation that does not fight has rights in the world that belligerents or war cannot destroy, we have been strong in our neutrality and no one has made war on us because of that stand. Nations at war are busy with actual enemies. They do not deliberately attempt to turn neutrals into enemies.

#### MORALITY AT STAKE

Let's keep our thinking straight. Just because one nation attacks another and war begins, the warring states do not thereby gain all the rights to the whole earth. Neutrals still have rights and they still have duties. One of these rights is to protest wrongdoing and advantage taking wherever it exists. You cannot be impartial if one combatant only commits the wrong. A referee in the prize ring must be neutral, and his neutrality makes him impartial as long as both fighters are fair; but when one fouls, the referee must still remain neutral; he has no right to take part in the fight, but he need not be impartial and declare the fight a draw just because one man fouls. Without changing one bit his neutral position, he penalizes the wrongdoer. His neutrality is preserved but his impartiality has gone. The rights of both fighters and the referee are all preserved. A neutrality that demands an impartiality calls for a dulling of every moral impulse. It insists upon erasing the line between good and evil. That is asking too much. That reduces a neutral to an unbearable impotence. A neutral has a right to stand for something in the world, not for nothing. If neutrality means a crushing of world morality, it is better that we take sides and fight, because fighting for a right is better than passive submission to a wrong.

Neutrality is a matter of degree. Take, for example, the different theories expressed today about Italy's neutrality—is Italy's neutrality today to the advantage of Germany, Italy's ally, or it is to the advantage of Germany's enemies? Thus, if we answer the question we discover that neutrality must rest upon some other reason than that of a desire to be impartial. That reason may be an entirely selfish one on the part of a neutral just to avoid war. It may be, as many have expressed the American neutrality to be, an action on the part of a great neutral, which will discourage war in the world. Our most consistent stand is one based on morality, a morality which recognizes that we have rights which even belligerents must respect, a morality which recognizes that even belligerents have rights, which makes it our duty to respect those rights; a morality, too, which entitles us to condemn wherever we



see wrongdoing if need be by any action short of war. That, I am sure, is the true American stand.

A condemnation of a wrongdoer has never brought war. When the nations of the world, through the agency of the League of Nations, attempted to impose sanctions on Italy in accordance with the theory that economic pressure could stop war, Mussolini started the cry that sanctions meant war. But sanctions did not mean war. Mussolini did not go to war against any state that imposed those sanctions, but Mussolini wiped out of existence the little state of Albania, which refused to vote sanctions. Thus, sloganized thinking and historical fact are very different propositions.

#### INCONSISTENCIES IN ACT

The test of the American Neutrality Act will come out of uncertainties in administration of the act, not from emotional reactions about theory. If we should ultimately find ourselves in war, that action will come as a result of emotional reaction, because of a sense of outraged justice. That is an emotional deduction. That will be action of impulse without deliberating over all the factors and weighing all the costs. I do not think that America will ever modify the Neutrality Act because she will deliberately want to take sides. If we get into that frame of mind, we will go to war without modification of the Neutrality Act. But the circumstances about the administration of the Neutrality Act will furnish the stimulus for the act's modification. For example, when we see the inconsistency of not allowing the sale of a shell to a belligerent but allowing the shipment of all that goes into that shell, when we see that we cannot sell guncotton to a belligerent but that we can sell all the raw cotton which can be converted into guncotton, we will readily see these inconsistencies in the act.

When the inconsistencies are discovered the stage is properly set for a modification of the act, but immediately comes another factor which may be a controlling one and which shows how a nation of impartiality must fail. Can you change the rules of the game after the game has started? If it is to the advantage of one belligerent to change the rules, and to the disadvantage of another belligerent to change the rules, will the modification be an impartial act?

Another test of our Neutrality Act which may bring the necessity for a modification will be a changed world situation. When the Neutrality Acts were passed, America attempted to write her part for the war drama assuming that her part could fit into any stage setting that might be brought about. It is the mandatory provision in the act that does this. Can our part be the same in a great war where the belligerents are many score and the neutrals are few, as it is in a war where the belligerents are two or three and the neutrals are many score? Can our neutrality be the same when there are two distinct wars being carried on, one in Asia and one in Europe, as it is when there is one World War? When the line-up of belligerents and neutrals is constantly changing, as it probably will, can our Neutrality Act remain static while everything it affects or is affected by it is in a state of flux? These are the types of questions which should make us thoughtful about the conditions facing us under the present circumstances.

#### HISTORY CAN TEACH AVOIDANCE

Due to the fact that there has been since 1935 much discussion about the Neutrality Acts and our remaining out of war as a result of them, persons have become confused. With a major war in Europe we would have been operating as we are today as a result of a neutrality proclamation even if there were no 1937 Neutrality Act on the statute books. We have the status of a neutral as the result of the existence of the law of nations, and the President's proclamations are in accordance with long-standing precedents and such acts as those of 1909, 1917, and 1937. If the people of the United States wish to remain neutral, they can do so as long as they wish. America remained neutral from August 1914 to April 1917, nearly 3 years, during the World War. If our ultimate entrance into the World War was a mistake, as many today insist, we should study our history from 1914 to 1917 and avoid the mistakes that led us into the war.

History viewed objectively will contribute greatly to an appreciation of the problems which will face our Nation now as a neutral. It is our nature to wisecrack. Our language and our life invite it. We say "the Constitution is what the judges say it is" and "that history is what the historians say it is." Both statements are pretty. They can be acceptably used to cover vast ignorance, even though they were originally uttered by the most learned. Anyone who wants to understand our Government's neutral problems today should study the history of 1914-17. Objective study will show that we can remain neutral, maintain our neutral rights, live up to our neutral duties if we have a mind to. Study, too, will show that America is more united in opinion today than she was in 1914, but President Wilson's neutrality proclamation received the same whole-hearted support from all our citizens in August 1914 as President Roosevelt's did today. Even ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, who later so strongly took sides and urged in the strongest terms that America should enter the war on the side of England and France, wrote during the first weeks of the war, "Of course it would be folly to jump into the gulf ourselves, and to no good purpose, and very probably nothing that we could have done would have helped Belgium. We have not the smallest responsibility for what has befallen her" (Outlook, September 23, 1914).

Let us review the first days of the 1914 World War and our neutrality then. We will find much that is the same; still we will see a great difference. Then we assumed a European war was, after all, not of our concern. Today we may assert that, but we know it is hardly true. The real truth in each case is and was

that war anywhere is of universal concern. Peace, too, must be of universal concern. Regardless of what anyone may think or hope, the world is a unit in more ways than in its purely physical one.

Today no one expects anyone to be neutral in mind and thought. One Nation-wide poll on who is responsible for the present war shows that 82 percent of our people hold one side responsible. That does not give great promise for impartiality.

#### WHEAT WILSON URGED

In 1914, President Wilson, 2 weeks after issuing his neutrality proclamation, said: "The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are trying men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle above another. My thought is of America—a Nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own councils, and which keeps herself fit and free to do what is honest and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world."

But proclamations and speeches do not alter facts. They are powerless when it comes to changing men's opinions. The people of our country were not impartial in thought. Still they remained neutral in fact as far as actions were concerned for nearly 3 years. They stood on their rights and they condemned the wrongdoer. And while standing as a neutral their condemnation of a wrong did not take them into war. Had it done so we would have fought on both sides.

American neutrality has not been an unchanging thing from Washington's first neutrality proclamation to the present. It has grown and developed or it has become weak and supine, according to the emphasis. Sometimes neutral rights have been stressed, at other times neutral duties. There is an ocean of distance both in theory and fact between Jefferson's notion, that it was not the function of the Government to interfere with the economic affairs of the people and that as many people made their living in manufacturing arms their sale should not be prohibited, and the 1937 Neutrality Act. From the beginning to the present the American tendency has been to interpret neutrality to mean impartiality and to withdraw all moral judgments and base our stand of neutrality upon a simple rule of law instead of upon moral actions. It is nevertheless here where our neutrality has failed and we have turned to war. Therefore let's give up the "impartial" dream which has never held when our sense of justice has been outraged and place our neutrality upon the fundamental rights of a nation to carry on its peaceful pursuits even during war without being a party to the war. Whatever our neutrality has meant during the last 140 years, the right to stay at peace has been stronger than our dream of being impartial in thought, word, speech, and action.

Let us stand upon this platform—war between two or more nations cannot diminish the rights of any nation or nations that want to remain at peace. Maintain that stand upon a moral basis. Then American neutrality will stand and become the force in the world it should be.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That speech was delivered on the night of September 11. On the night of September 14 the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] spoke on the radio, and in his address these words were used:

The talk here in Washington is no longer that of merely furnishing arms. It is said we must prepare to fight. One of my colleagues, a most able and sincere Senator, declared a few nights ago publicly: "Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better," said he, "to take sides and fight."

He was speaking out boldly what is now heard from the same sources from which came the agitation of furnishing arms. And, if in a few months we can tear up the law which a nation almost universally approved, how long do you think it will take to put across the proposition of sending our young men into the trenches once we have intervened?

Mr. President, it will be noted that the senior Senator from Idaho did not use my name, did not mention my name, and I am sure that I could not claim the authorship of the words quoted in the extract. I heard the address over the radio. It did not seem to me that I could possibly be the author of those words. In fact, to anyone who has read anything about international law or international relations, the sentence about impartiality and neutrality is indeed such a stupid sentence that my feelings are almost hurt when I realize that it has been charged up to me.

The following morning, in telling the story of the radio address made by the Senator from Idaho, the editorial writer, or, rather, probably the man on the desk in the newspaper office, did a bit of editorial work and put in parentheses that the senior Senator from Idaho was referring to the junior Senator from Utah, gave my name, and let it go out to the world that I had made that statement.

Then, Mr. President, some very interesting things happened. On the 13th of September the Chicago Tribune had a full column and a quarter editorial about our going

to war, and in that editorial was a reference to the junior Senator from Utah.

My pride, of course, was exceedingly great to realize that my name was used in the editorial of a great metropolitan newspaper, because that has not occurred very often in my lifetime. In my lifetime, too, I have done some editorial writing, so I know that only certain people are on the accredited list, and I knew that I was not on the accredited list of any newspaper columnist or any newspaper editor. Therefore, it was gratifying to have broken into the press, and I am very grateful for that. But to have broken into the press, and then to have been given credit for something which I am not entitled to, of course, hurt my feelings and cut my pride.

In its editorial the Chicago Tribune carries on as follows:

Now it is proposed—it is Mr. Roosevelt's proposal—that with a recognized state of war in Europe and with the Neutrality Act in effect there shall be an amendment permitting Americans to sell munitions to nations which can purchase for cash, take title to the goods, and transport them in their own ships. That means that the British and French can put orders for any supplies they need with American factories.

Administration spokesmen—

Mr. President, note that—

Administration spokesmen leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to the purpose of this. Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah Democrat of the Foreign Relations Committee, said in a radio address that a neutrality which does not distinguish between good and evil reduces the neutral country to an unbearable impotence. The righteous neutrality, he said, did not mean impartiality. "Therefore," he said, "let us give up the impartial dream which has never held when our sense of justice has been outraged." This expresses the view of Mr. Roosevelt's administration and the American people should give it full consideration.

Mr. President, it was true that when I came to the Senate I had been a college professor, and there was much talk of the "brain trust," but I was never able to break into that sanctified group. Probably I was barred because of my age. I know it has been said that a number of us speak for the administration, but, in the whole history of the Presidency of the United States, there never was a time when the President was so well able to speak for himself as at the present time, nor has any President with greater insistence spoken for himself.

In the past we have had spokesmen for the administration, but anyone who characterizes Franklin D. Roosevelt as an ancient leader of Israel—Moses—characterized himself as one being slow of speech and therefore needing a spokesman, is using his imagination in a way that simply does not fit the facts.

There have been persons in the Roosevelt administration who have spoken for the administration. A colleague of mine from Columbia University, a former professor, in the earlier days, spoke for the President. He is now writing about him, but he no longer speaks for the President. Another colleague of mine, a great general, whom I highly respected in war days, and still do, spoke for the President for some time. Now he is writing a column. He does not any longer speak for the President.

Mr. President, in the light of these circumstances, and being somewhat familiar with history, the last thing I should want to become would be spokesman for the President. I ask, who would like to be an Aaron for Franklin D. Roosevelt? I would not.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I do not think the Senator should be unduly disturbed about that Chicago Tribune editorial, because no one ever reads an editorial in the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Now, Mr. President, I am sunk. [Laughter.] Here I have been getting great satisfaction from the fact that at last I have broken into the columns of the press only to learn that in this great country of ours no one reads the editorial.

The Chicago Daily News of the 15th of September carried the following story:

Except to call attention to the President's neutrality proclamations and his special session call, BORAH did not directly mention Roosevelt, but he replied—again without identifying his target—to the Monday night radio argument by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah, administration backer.

"It is now proposed," said BORAH, "to repeal entirely this provision of the law, to enable this Government to furnish arms to one side and to withhold them from the other. All anyone need do to know that this is the real, the controlling, purpose of repeal, is to read the literature on repeal down to the last 48 hours.

The talk here in Washington is no longer that of merely furnishing arms. It is said: "We must prepare to fight." One of my colleagues—meaning Mr. THOMAS of Utah—declared a few nights ago publicly, "Let us give up the dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better," said he, "to take sides and fight."

On September 17 the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was again quoted in the Chicago Tribune. The heading refers to THOMAS' speech:

My friend, Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, one of the leading revisionists, let the cat out of the bag the other night as to the real position of the neutrality revisionists when he boldly declared: "Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better to take sides and fight." Those who favor the course of taking sides and fighting should naturally vote for the repeal of the arms embargo as a vital step in that direction. Those who favor keeping out of war should vote for the retention of our present safeguards and the addition of any others which may be necessary.

Mr. President, some of the words in this quotation, or misquotation, are found in my talk. Part of them, however, are found on page 9 of my talk, and the other part, not identically, on page 5. A very interesting sentence has been made up, a sentence which is illogical and meaningless; and I was perfectly happy to have forgotten all about it, in spite of the things I shall show, until last Saturday night, when I was debating the question before the Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, on the program with Dr. Borchard, Dr. Fenwick, and Dr. Libby.

My colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], delivered a 3-hour address, and from that 3-hour address Dr. Borchard found nothing that he deemed worthy of quoting except this sentence of mine. I do not know whether or not that is a reflection upon the Senator from Missouri or his speech. I do not think so. The point is that this thing was started again over the country, and the newspapers around Yale University carried the quotation from the Senator from Missouri. The reason why they carried it was because the Senator, in his remarks on page 280 of the RECORD, had this to say:

There are, in this country, perfectly honorable and patriotic men and women who conceive that our interests are so inextricably interwoven with those of Great Britain and France and Poland that we should step forward openly and frankly as a partner and ally. They agreed with the blunt declaration made only a few weeks ago by Foreign Minister George Bonnet of France, that it is the duty of the United States to come forward boldly and announce that in the event of war we would be found fighting with all our men and all our resources on the side of Great Britain, France, and Poland. Now that the catastrophe of war has occurred, they would have the United States proceed without delay to take its place in the struggle on the side of those Allies. With regard to neutrality, they echo with enthusiasm the frank and candid words of the able and erudite Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], one of the authors of the committee substitute, when he said, in a recent radio address:

"Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore of neutrality. It is better to take sides and fight."

With such a view I am in passionate disagreement, and I believe that the American people when they completely understand the issue will be in overwhelming disagreement. But, Mr. President, while I violently and completely dissent from the judgment, I respect such opinions when openly and candidly expressed.

The throwing in of the word "impartiality," of course, brought the attention of the country to the real situation about the law of neutrality. There is no law of impartiality; but there is a law of neutrality. I imagine that if one were to go to the trouble of looking up the adjectives "neutral" and "impartial," he would find that probably both are described by the same synonym, "unbiased." However, if one searches through the international lawbooks, he will find the law of neutrality, but he will never find the law of impartiality. I know, too, as I shall later show, that it has been the American interpretation of the law that a neutral should act in such a way that he is impartial in regard to belligerents.

On the 18th of September the United States News gave over its whole editorial page to an article entitled "The Partiality Law." That, and other references, brought forth a consideration of the idea of impartiality in the press of the country.



Dr. Charles A. Beard was asked to write, and did write, a series of articles for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, merely giving information in regard to the question before us. The first sentence in the first article of Dr. Beard's paper shows the point which I have been trying to make, and shows the reason for it. We all know where Dr. Beard stands on this question. His opening statement is:

Neutrality does not mean and never can mean "impartiality" in the sense that American policy and acts must confer the same or equal benefits upon both sides in the war.

About this same time, Mr. President, an advertisement was published throughout the country in a great number of newspapers. I am sure it was this advertisement which brought forth the great avalanche of letters which came to me, especially as a result of my being made a part of the "war-mongering crowd," as we are called. This advertisement stated plainly:

The revision of the Neutrality Act means war for America.

Mr. President, we cannot blame anyone for being worked up under such circumstances, and for taking it for granted that an advertisement which is put in a newspaper is based upon facts. So, of course, no one can have any feeling except of the most respectful kind toward anyone who took the trouble to write.

Mr. President, really great and honest consideration should be given to the situation we have caused. I spoke on a Nation-wide radio hook-up. My address attracted absolutely no attention. I received probably the usual 50 or 60 "fan" and "pan" letters. I shall have to take back the "pan," because I received no "panning" at all. I received only "fan" mail as a result of my talk.

Then came the misquotation. My mail jumped into the hundreds, and every letter was a "panning" letter, written with a bitterness and hate which cannot help but influence anyone.

Mr. President, it would be wrong to bring before the Senate many of those letters; but I shall bring to the attention of the Senate three of them, to show how cruel letters can be, and how unjust it is even to misquote a man in whom the country is in no way interested.

This letter is dated September 17. It came in an envelope and was signed, but bore no return address. The envelope was postmarked in two towns in Massachusetts. The letter reads:

DEAR SENATOR: If you want to fight so badly, go join the British Army. It's a wonder to me how men of your caliber ever get into the Senate or anywhere else as far as that goes. You seem to forget that you are elected to fulfill certain obligations—primarily to keep peace. If we wanted war, we could have hired a dictator. You ought to know that war is a costly game and that the winners lose. You're a Senator, not a ditch digger; so use that head of yours. Best wishes,

A. C. WHITE.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that letter would cause anyone some concern; but on the next day I received a letter from one of our great universities, from a man who signs himself "Ph. D." and "M. D.," and who is the head of a large department in one of America's greatest universities. It will be noted that I have eliminated his name and the name of the college, because I am going to say some rather harsh things about this letter:

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: According to newspaper reports the following is attributed to you: "Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better to take sides and fight." If these statements were really used by you and they represent your feelings as a United States Senator, then I wish to take strenuous exception to them. With due respect to your position, I think at this critical time, when the feelings of citizens can be so easily aroused, it is the solemn duty of our political leaders to be very temperate in their public utterances. I may further tell you that I have supported President Roosevelt in many of his proposals, but your utterances were the final argument to set me very firmly against lifting the embargo on arms. A number of my friends share my feelings. As an administration spokesman you have placed the Government in a very vulnerable position. In my opinion, the many Congressmen and millions of citizens who oppose lifting the embargo have a clear-cut case against the Government, and their argument that lifting the embargo brings us very close to if not in the war becomes a most convincing one.

I sincerely hope that other Government supporters will find more logical and humane arguments for lifting the embargo than those which are implied in your alleged public utterances, which seem to me so inflammatory and ill-advised at this time.

Certainly your statements do not harmonize with the same words used by our President in his recent radio address. It is my most earnest hope that whatever action is taken in Congress, it will be based on the premise that the United States will not enter into the present lamentable European carnage.

This letter presents my personal opinion and in no way is connected with my duties at the university.

Mr. President, the seriousness of such a letter, sent by a man who signs himself "Ph. D." and "M. D." is this: Such a writer breaks the cardinal canon of all scientific work. If a student came before this professor and expected to have bestowed upon him a doctor's degree, and attempted to bring in something as hearsay, he would be "flunked" immediately. Yet this man, who is a guide, passes judgment, by the merest kind of hearsay, and immediately condemns a colleague to a position in which he himself would hate to find himself. I repeat, the cardinal canon of scientific work is to state facts, to find facts, to get facts, and at all times never make a misquotation.

Another letter came which is not only very cruel but very filthy—the type of letter which all of us have received lately. I have copied part of this letter because it is a letter written by an extremely foolish man, and it is a letter, I know, written by a man who knows nothing about war, and who knows nothing about the responsibilities in connection with war:

If you want to fight, why don't you go over and fight yourself? You're sitting pretty. Send yourself; don't send us. We don't like to get killed any more than you do. Maybe you don't know this. It is a lot easier to order someone else to die than it is to die yourself.

Mr. President, those words cut to the quick. I have seen more war than I dare talk about or think about, not only our own wars but wars in other places.

To me there is nothing heroic about war. If war comes tomorrow, probably I shall be doing just exactly the same thing that I did during the last war—running errands, obeying orders, carrying out certain details. I repeat, there is no longer anything heroic about war. It is a grim tragedy, and everyone must share the burden.

The thing in that letter that cut was the fact that the writer had hit a man who did not have an opportunity to order divisions or regiments or companies to do certain things, but a man whose duty it was to pick individuals. Mr. President, I am guilty of having selected men and having shot them over ahead of their companions on replacement calls; and the foolish man who wrote that letter does not know anything about the fact that it is easier to send someone else over the top than it is to go yourself. The foolish man who thinks those things does not know the experience of practically every thoughtful officer in the United States Army who learned from actual experience that the happiest day of his life was not when he could give the command "You go" or "Forward," but when he realized that he was able to say, "Let's go." That became the characteristic of the American boys and the American Army on the other side; and that was easier by almost any kind of degree than the selection of a boy here whose mother and father you know, and a boy there whose mother and father you know, and sending him out of turn. It was not an easy task. I repeat, the extremely foolish man who accepts such a philosophy of life and such an idea of his Government is not contributing anything to the upbuilding of manhood in this country or to a recognition of the fact that his Government is a government of the people and supposed to represent the people.

This quotation has reached other countries. On October 7 I received a postal card sealed in an envelope, mailed in Montreal, and sent to me, addressed:

MEIN HERR: We have orders to prepare the way to the German armies that will invade the United States soon.

Gas tests were made in New York and Boston subways lately.

You do not imagine that the rotten American Army can resist our victorious armies longer than the Polish armies did.

Our Fuehrer will make you kneel down and will seize all the American wealth soon.

This is signed by a gentleman by the name of "Fritz Hitler"; but it comes as a result of that quotation.

Mr. President, out of fairness to myself, since I have taken the time I have consumed to deny—if that is the proper word—that I ever thought or could ever use the type of sentence that has been credited to me, it is necessary, I think, that I tell those who are kind enough to listen what was said in this radio talk.

Remember, the President had not called Congress into extraordinary session. When this talk was given, we did not know whether there was to be an extraordinary session. Those of us who had been asked whether the President would call an extraordinary session had always answered, or at least I had, that of course any President of the United States would like to have the Congress in session during any time of great emergency.

I was requested to give this talk over the radio, and in promising to do so I said, "I will do it only on one condition, that is, that it can be a talk, not in advocacy of anything, but a talk in explanation of the problems which face the country in regard to neutrality. There is no partisanship in this talk, there is no taking sides. It is a talk delivered primarily so that the people of the country, and especially the students who are starting into school and are going to study these things, might see the big problems in relation to neutrality."

After analyzing the various kinds of neutrality, and pointing out that physical conditions call for different types of neutrality, I proceeded:

For these and other reasons it is difficult indeed to put definite exactness into the meaning of "neutrality" as that word is now used in the world and for that matter in the United States.

America's Neutrality Act has behind it definite objectives, and these objectives are worthy in every sense. They were expressed at their very best at the time of the discussion of the Neutrality Act of 1935, when our Democratic leader, the late Senator Joe Robinson, uttered the sentence, "We want no war, and we want no profits from war." After 4 years of neutrality legislation, I am convinced that the American people want two things, as these wants are expressed in our present Neutrality Act. First, they desire to reduce as much as possible the danger of any war profits which might involve us in a war, for few Americans want to see America involved in war, and, second, the average American wants to see America's economic and moral forces kept in a position so that she may not be a contributor to war or the war maker, but so that she may be able to use her moral and economic forces for peace in the world when the time for making peace comes. There are, of course, tremendous differences of opinion about how best to accomplish these objectives. America's task today, then, is to produce the type of unity which will cause her to remain uninvolved and at the same time contribute to the promotion of peace and to the limitation of the war area. We shall soon see whether our Neutrality Act is an aid or a hindrance in the accomplishment of these desires.

If we can remain objective at all times, unimpulsive in our thinking; if we can live down slogans and the effects of words of uncertain meanings, upon our actions America can remain out of the war regardless of how severe it may become. America can still maintain, not in the absolute but generally speaking, all of her neutral rights, but we will maintain our neutral rights longer if we stress our neutral duties and if we sincerely live in accordance with those neutral duties that are now devolved upon us. Those duties are rather definite.

Imagine being charged with wanting to go to war as a result of a speech containing the following:

The President's two proclamations, the Neutrality Act, and the President's Sunday night radio talk have all contributed to showing us what are our duties. Nothing will be gained by any one either within the United States or without if America finds herself involved in war. The good that can possibly come to the world as a result of restored peace will of necessity be the good that will come as a result of a good peace. The more neutrals there are in the world when the time for making peace comes, the better will be the thinking of the world, and the force of the objective thinking will be able to temper the impulses of both the victor and the vanquished.

At the end of the World War, due to the fact that all of the great nations had entered the war, the peacemakers and their peoples were caught between two emotions—one to punish and the other to build a new world order. So strong were these conflicts that it was deemed necessary to join in one document both the punishing elements and the constructive plans. This made universal support for the whole document impossible and caused those who really opposed but a part to oppose the whole. Next time may the neutral force in the world be so strong and so aloof that the victor-vanquished settlements may be confined to those limited

problems and the constructive planning for world peace be left to nations at peace planning for a peace which will be upbuilding for all—not a peace made by victors.

Then I get into the discussion of impartiality:

#### IMPARTIALITY AIDS STRONGER

Now, everyone is interested in the test of our Neutrality Act. If it has defects and therefore needs amendment, those defects will be shown very quickly. The act implies a neutrality based upon the theory of impartiality. I have always held that, while American law always assumed this and text writers have maintained that neutrality meant impartiality, this could not be. First, because impartiality could never be obtainable. Neutrality can be proclaimed and lived up to, but try as we will impartiality, even though proclaimed, can never be lived up to. If two nations are contending and a neutral does nothing, the effect of inaction is to aid the stronger of those two nations. If the neutral acts in an impartial way and treats each in exactly the same way the effect still is to aid the stronger. If the neutral takes sides he, of course, is not impartial.

Let us make our illustration even simpler: Two men are fighting to the death on a desert. One gains all the water, the other has none. You, a neutral, come along with plenty of water. You say this fight does not concern you because you are a neutral and you stand on your neutral rights and do nothing. From the standpoint of the law of neutrality you have done no wrong, but you have not been impartial. You know that the withholding of the water from the one has meant his certain death and victory for the other.

Therefore, impartial neutrality in a practical sense is utterly impossible. That which is impossible in fact is very poor substance on which to base a rule of law. To the extent that our neutral stands have been based upon impartiality they have been weak. When we have taken the position that neutrality means remaining aloof from war upon the theory that a nation that does not fight has rights in the world that belligerents or war cannot destroy, we have been strong in our neutrality and no one has made war on us because of that stand. Nations at war are busy with actual enemies. They do not deliberately attempt to turn neutrals into enemies.

#### MORALITY AT STAKE

Let's keep our thinking straight. Just because one nation attacks another and war begins, the warring states do not thereby gain all the rights to the whole earth. Neutrals still have rights and they still have duties. One of these rights is to protest wrongdoing and advantage-taking wherever it exists. You cannot be impartial if one combatant only commits the wrong. A referee in the prize ring must be neutral, and his neutrality makes him impartial as long as both fighters are fair, but when one fouls the referee must still remain neutral, he has no right to take part in the fight, but he need not be impartial and declare the fight a draw just because one man fouls. Without changing one bit his neutral position he penalizes the wrongdoer. His neutrality is preserved but his impartiality has gone. The rights of both fighters and the referee are all preserved. A neutrality that demands an impartiality calls for a dulling of every moral impulse. It insists upon erasing the line between good and evil. That is asking too much. That reduces a neutral to an unbearable impotence. A neutral has a right to stand for something in the world, not for nothing. If neutrality means a crushing of world morality it is better that we take sides and fight, because fighting for a right is better than passive submission to a wrong.

Now, Mr. President, let me ask a simple question? Is there a boy in a Mohammedan country who goes to Friday school, is there a boy in a Jewish country who goes to Saturday school, or is there a boy in a Christian country who goes to Sunday school, who would not accept the logic of fighting for what is right?

The whole essence of the great civilization, built upon these three great creeds, demands that of all of us. What is there startlingly wrong about a Senator of the United States declaring that, when the question is a question between right and wrong, I would rather fight than submit to a wrong? Does our oath mean nothing? Does the oath of an Army officer of the United States mean nothing? Simply because we are attempting to be just in a world where certain nations are at war, must we be impotent? Have we not some rights? Cannot we stand where Jefferson and Washington taught us to stand in the beginning of our evolution as a neutral nation? Jefferson said that the fact that two nations act like wolves toward each other is no reason why we have to take part in their fighting. The beginning of American neutrality was when we took the position that a neutral state had the right to exist in the world even when belligerent states were tearing each other to pieces.

Mr. President, reference has been made to a certain phrase as "a famous phrase." I do not know just why it should be so famous. It is in every international elementary textbook I have ever seen. That is the phrase, "take action



short of war." Yet some people thought President Roosevelt invented that phrase. I go so far as to say that our embargo under the provisions of our Neutrality Act is an act "short of war," if it is supposed to restrain belligerents, and not in any sense a warlike act.

I now come to another part of my radio address, and then I am through:

Study, too, will show that America is more united in opinion today than she was in 1914, but President Wilson's neutrality proclamation received the same wholehearted support from all our citizens in August 1914, as President Roosevelt's did today. Even ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, who later so strongly took sides and urged in the strongest terms that America should enter the war on the side of England and France, wrote during the first weeks of the war, "Of course it would be folly to jump into the gulf ourselves, and to no good purpose, and very probably nothing that we could have done would have helped Belgium. We have not the smallest responsibility for what has befallen her." (Outlook—September 23, 1914.)

Let us review the first days of the 1914 World War and our neutrality then. We will find much that is the same; still we will see a great difference. Then we assumed a European war was, after all, not of our concern. Today we may assert that but we know it is hardly true. The real truth in each case is and was that war anywhere is of universal concern. Peace, too, must be of universal concern. Regardless of what anyone may think or hope, the world is a unit in more ways than in its purely physical one.

Today no one expects anyone to be neutral in mind and thought. One Nation-wide poll on who is responsible for the present war shows that 82 percent of our people hold one side responsible. That does not give great promise for impartiality.

#### WHAT WILSON URGED

In 1914, President Wilson, 2 weeks after issuing his neutrality proclamation, said: "The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are trying men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle above another. My thought is of America—a Nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own councils, and which keeps herself fit and free to do what is honest and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world."

Wilson's first statement and his proclamation were based upon the theory of neutrality as announced by Washington and Jefferson.

But proclamations and speeches do not alter facts. They are powerless when it comes to changing men's opinions. The people of our country were not "impartial in thought." Still they remained "neutral in fact" as far as actions were concerned for nearly 3 years. They stood on their rights and they condemned the wrongdoer. And while standing as a neutral their condemnation of a wrong did not take them into war. Had it done so we would have fought on both sides.

American neutrality has not been an unchanging thing from Washington's first neutrality proclamation to the present. It has grown and developed or it has become weak and supine, according to the emphasis. Sometimes neutral rights have been stressed, at other times neutral duties. There is an ocean of distance both in theory and fact between Jefferson's notion, that it was not the function of the Government to interfere with the economic affairs of the people and that as many people made their living in manufacturing arms their sale should not be prohibited, and the 1937 Neutrality Act. From the beginning to the present the American tendency has been to interpret neutrality to mean impartiality and to withdraw all moral judgment and base our stand of neutrality upon a simple rule of law instead of upon moral actions. It is nevertheless here where our neutrality has failed and we have turned to war. Therefore let's give up—

Here is where I suggest the giving up—

Therefore, let's give up the "impartial" dream which has never held when our sense of justice has been outraged, and place our neutrality upon the fundamental rights of a nation to carry on its peaceful pursuits even during war without being a party to the war. Whatever our neutrality has meant during the last 140 years, the right to stay at peace has been stronger than our dream of being impartial in thought, word, speech, and action.

Let us stand upon this platform—war between two or more nations cannot diminish the rights of any nation or nations that want to remain at peace. Maintain that stand upon a moral basis. Then American neutrality will stand and become the force in the world it should be.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 17, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we would be like Him, who, with a consciousness deeper than the sea and higher than the stars, said calmly insistently: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." Wilt Thou show us the path of life: "In Thy presence is fullness of joy; at Thy right hand are pleasures forever more." Let us begin this day with a fine impulse sweeping through our breasts, possessing a vision that conquers fears and immortalizes hopes. O Thou who art the purest of the mighty and the mightiest of the pure, who dost guide the worlds through space, cannot be less wise and kind than the shepherd who leads his flock into green pastures. In a world in which we hear so much of the roar of things and whose future no one can foretell, O may we have a place in the hollow of Thy hand where our souls may find whiteness and our minds unity. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 13, 1939, was read and approved.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 calendar days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RANKIN. Including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. I would like to know what the idea of the gentleman is in making the request, because they all get permission to do it anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. My understanding is that we will probably adjourn over. We have been doing that. The RECORD will be printed every day, at any rate.

Mr. RICH. It would be a good thing if we did adjourn over, because if we had a roll call there would not be enough here to do business anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not object to adjourning over, but if we do, I would like the Members to have that permission.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would this include remarks made before other bureaus and boards?

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Mississippi was that all Members may have the right for 3 calendar days to extend their own remarks in the RECORD. It would not include excerpts or extraneous matter.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and insert a speech made by the Honorable Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### ROTARY CLUB, BEDFORD, IND.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent days of wars, of mass murder, it is good to know that we live in the United States of America, a peace-loving Nation. It is good to know that we have institutions in our country which work for peace and better world understanding. I am a charter member of a club which has a local in my home town of Bedford, Ind. I have been a member continuously since its founding. The work of this club, locally, by districts, by